

VU Research Portal

Beleidsonderzoek OCW

Westrik, H.C.

2012

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Westrik, H. C. (2012). *Beleidsonderzoek OCW*. VU CLUE Research Institute for the heritage and history of the Cultural Landscape and Urban Environment.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl



The Future of World Heritage

The Netherlands and the UNESCO World Heritage Convention

CLUE

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE HERITAGE AND HISTORY OF
THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE AND URBAN ENVIRONMENT

CAROL WESTRIK



UNIVERSITY
AMSTERDAM



Seventeenth-century canal
ring area of Amsterdam
inside the Singelgracht
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



The Wadden Sea
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



Rietveld Schröder House
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong

Beemster Polder
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



D.F. Wouda Steam
Pumping Station
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



Historic Area of Willemstad,
Inner City and Harbour,
Curaçao (the Netherlands).
© H.C. Westrik





Mill Network at Kinderdijk-
Elshout (the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



Defence Line of Amsterdam,
Fort Nigtevecht
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong



Schokland and Surroundings
(the Netherlands).
© Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl
/ N. de Jong

THE FUTURE OF WORLD HERITAGE

**The Future of
World Heritage**
The Netherlands
and the UNESCO
World Heritage
Convention

CAROL WESTRIK

Contents

	Introduction	7
1	The World Heritage Convention at its 40th Anniversary	9
1.1	The World Heritage Convention	9
1.2	The various bodies of the Convention	10
1.2.1	The States Parties	10
1.2.2	The World Heritage Committee	11
1.2.3	Advisory Bodies	11
1.2.4	The World Heritage Centre	12
1.2.5	The General Assembly of States Parties	12
1.3	Nomination processes, long-term vision and Periodic Reporting	13
1.3.1	Outstanding Universal Value	13
1.3.2	Global Strategy	13
1.3.3	Periodic Reporting	14
1.4	Other UNESCO Conventions and UN Policies	15
2	The Netherlands and World Heritage	16
2.1	The Netherlands and the Convention	16
2.1.1	Dutch points of view regarding World Heritage	16
2.1.2	Dutch World Heritage sites	17
2.2	Dutch experiences in the World Heritage Committee: some highlights	18
2.2.1	The first year: getting to know the process	19
2.2.2	Second year: African World Heritage Fund and climate change	20
2.2.3	The third year: management issues and Periodic Reporting	20
2.2.4	The fourth year: the first deletion from the World Heritage List	21
3	Issues Relevant to the Future of the Convention	23
3.1	Statement of OUV	24
3.2	Sustainability of the decision-making process and procedures	24
3.2.1	Time pressure	24
3.2.2	Politicisation	25
3.3	Credibility of the List	26
3.4	Maintenance and conservation of sites	27
3.4.1	Development and conservation	29
3.4.2	Best practice	31
3.4.3	Tourism	32
3.5	Training and capacity building	34
4	The List of World Heritage in Danger	35
4.1	Issues that can lead to placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger	35
4.2	Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger	36
4.3	Removal from the World Heritage List	39
4.4	Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism	40
5	The Various Funds – How Do They Operate?	43
5.1.	Funds-in-Trust	45
5.1.1	Netherlands Funds-in-Trust (NFiT)	46
5.2	Other Funds and forms of financial assistance	47

6	Recommendations and Observations	50
6.1	The Netherlands and the World Heritage Convention: General observations	50
6.2	Challenges for a sustainable World Heritage Convention	52
6.3	Relevant points for the Netherlands in relation to the Convention	53
	Notes	56
	References	60
	Annex I – Abbreviations	64
	Annex II– List of World Heritage in Danger (2012)	65

Introduction

This is a policy research report into the future of the World Heritage Convention for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Netherlands. It contains observations about the organizational structure that guides the Convention and recommendations on how the Netherlands as a State Party can work with the Convention, both within the Netherlands, and internationally. For various reasons forming an opinion regarding the future of the Convention is relevant for the Netherlands:

- The Netherlands is a State Party to the Convention and has thereby committed itself to contribute towards the working of the Convention and its own (World) Heritage;
- The Netherlands has nine World Heritage sites and ten sites on its Tentative List: a strong Convention is of Dutch interest, whereas a devaluation of the Convention and the World Heritage List will also affect the Dutch sites;
- The Dutch sites have to deal with issues related to their World Heritage status, such as conservation and management of their site in accordance with the Convention: international co-operation within the Convention will provide guidance, inspiration and support;
- The Netherlands has always been committed to the Convention, as demonstrated by its membership of the Committee in the period 2003-2007, and by its commitment to the working of the Convention, e.g. via Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. Other States Parties and sites can benefit from sharing Dutch experiences with respect to site management and conservation just as the Dutch Government and sites can benefit from theirs;
- For the World Heritage Convention to be sustainable and to deal with the existing challenges, a pro-active attitude of States Parties is required, thus also from the Netherlands.

The structure of this report is as follows:

Brief description of the working and current policy situation regarding the World Heritage Convention (chapter 1);

Overview of twenty years of Dutch involvement with the World Heritage Convention (1992-2012) (chapter 2);

Analysis of issues relevant to the future of the World Heritage Convention that also impact Dutch World Heritage policies (chapters 3-5);

Policy recommendations (chapter 6).

The following topics have been selected:

- The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SoOUV);
- Sustainability of the decision-making process, conservation issues, and training and capacity building;
- The List of World Heritage in Danger;
- The various Funds associated with the World Heritage Convention.

The research offers an insider's perspective. It is based on over fifteen years of experience with the World Heritage Convention, both in the context of the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO, as the secretary of the Dutch delegation to the World Heritage Committee, attending the General Assemblies (GA) of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, numerous experts meetings, and recently as the secretary and coordinator of the Dutch *Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl*. Another invaluable source of information has been the many informal conversations and formal interviews with UNESCO staff, members of the Advisory Bodies and

heritage experts, both in the Netherlands and abroad. It is furthermore based on an analysis of UNESCO documents right up to June 2012, as listed in the References. Academic literature on the World Heritage Convention turned out to be less relevant for this report, since most of these (heritage) studies focus on the effects of UNESCO World Heritage policies on specific sites or on specific national heritage politics. This report does not address these types of question as such, but focuses on the procedures, the technical mechanisms and the political process that guide the Convention. It is a plea for sustained Dutch commitment to the Convention, in order to contribute to a sustainable future for this well-known global policy instrument to protect cultural and natural heritage worldwide.

Funding for this research was granted by the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science and it was written as part of the Research Institute for the heritage and history of the Cultural Landscape and Urban Environment (CLUE), *Vrije Universiteit* (VU), Amsterdam. I would like to thank Dr. Kees Somer from this ministry for all his co-operation and Prof. Dr. Susan Legêne from the VU for her guidance during the process. Further thanks for his support goes to Dré van Marrewijk from the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency and special thanks to Professor Dr. Christina Cameron from Montreal University and Dr. Christopher Young from English Heritage for their input, advice and support.

1 The World Heritage Convention at its 40th Anniversary

1.1 The World Heritage Convention

In 2012 the World Heritage Convention celebrates its 40th anniversary. Some say that this is indeed a reason to celebrate because of the success of the Convention, whereas others are of the opinion that the Convention is in a precarious situation. This chapter, as will indeed the rest of this research, will look into the workings of the Convention: the good, the bad and the ugly.

The 1972 UNESCO *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, also known as the World Heritage Convention, is one of the most successful UNESCO Conventions with 189 States Parties out of the now 195 Member States of UNESCO. The Convention entered into force on 17 December 1975 and it was the first international instrument to encompass both natural and cultural heritage.¹

The aim of the Convention is the ‘identification, protection, conservation, presentation and transmission to future generations of cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value’.² It generates attention for each World Heritage site with its specific Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) and exceptional character, but also for conservation challenges at large. World Heritage status can thus also raise awareness to broader heritage issues and get discussions started on how heritage is valued by the local, national and international community. Many examples in the history of the World Heritage Convention are a testimony to this effect (see the References for more general literature on this matter).

Though the Convention is mostly known for the World Heritage List, it is about more than that. Article 5 contains general responsibilities for each State Party regarding the conservation of natural and cultural heritage in general, not just World Heritage, like taking effective and active measures for the protection, conservation and presentation of this heritage situated on its territory.³ In the Netherlands, this responsibility is well secured in heritage laws, and institutions like the Cultural Heritage Agency under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. We will therefore not elaborate here on this general obligation.

The Convention is also intended as a tool for international co-operation as clearly stipulated in Article 7 of the Convention: ‘International protection of the world cultural and natural heritage shall be understood to mean the establishment of a system of international co-operation and assistance designed to support States Parties to the Convention in their efforts to conserve and identify that heritage’. This international component of the Convention is of added value to the individual States Parties as it can assist them with conservation issues they may face, and can be instrumental in developing cultural, technical and economic co-operation. The Preamble of the Convention emphasises the shared responsibility for this exceptional heritage:

Considering that, in view of the magnitude and gravity of the new dangers threatening them, it is incumbent on the international community as a whole to participate in the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of outstanding universal value, by the granting of collective assistance which, although not taking the place of action by the State concerned, will serve as an efficient complement thereto.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) underlines the importance of the Convention when it states that it ‘has the potential to directly conserve perhaps 10% by area of

all of the world's protected areas and, through this leverage, to also provide example sites that can positively influence the remainder of the global protected area estate'.⁴ This emphasis on international collaboration is rooted in UNESCO's mission statement. The Preamble to the Constitution declares that 'since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed'. UNESCO was established in 1945, in the wake of World War II with the aim:

[...] to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.⁵

The World Heritage Convention supports UNESCO's goals. World Heritage status intends to contribute to a shared understanding of each other's heritage, both on a national and international level, although the past forty years have also demonstrated that World Heritage status as such is no guarantee for peace.

Firstly, the way the Convention is organized will be summarized, followed by a brief explanation of what makes a site World Heritage: the Outstanding Universal Value.

1.2 The various bodies of the Convention

The Convention has five major players: the States Parties, the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, and the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention. The relationship and balance between the various players is dynamic: many internal and outside forces influence the effectiveness and outcomes of World Heritage policies. The 2007 *Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre* recommended a further delineation of the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Clarification was needed concerning the 'organisation of joint missions, the drafting of state of conservation reports, the rules for allocating management of studies and analyses requested by the Committee or extrabudgetary partners'.⁶ This further delineation of roles is currently being worked out and implemented.

An important aspect of the Convention are the *Operational Guidelines* which aim to facilitate the implementation of the Convention. The *Operational Guidelines* give a definition of World Heritage and explain, amongst other things, the process for inscription of properties on the World Heritage List and the process for monitoring the state of conservation of the sites. When the Convention came into effect in 1976, with the ratification by twenty States Parties, the *Operational Guidelines* were drafted for the first time. Two years later, in 1978, the first sites were placed on the List. With 962 sites in 2012, the financial sustainability of the system is under threat, as will be discussed below.⁷ The number of sites on the World Heritage List grows every year; the resources, however, do not. The *Operational Guidelines* can be changed by a decision of the World Heritage Committee, whereas changes to the Convention would need the agreement of all the States Parties. Over the past forty years, the *Operational Guidelines* have been revised several times to take into account certain Committee decisions. This will be discussed below as well.

1.2.1 The States Parties

When States Parties adhere to the World Heritage Convention, they 'agree to identify and nominate properties on their national territory to be considered for inscription on the

World Heritage List'.⁸ Currently 32 States Parties have no properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.⁹

Paragraph 15 of the *Operational Guidelines* stipulates the responsibilities of the States Parties. These include ensuring the identification, nomination, protection, conservation, presentation, and transmission to future generations of the cultural and natural heritage found within their territory, to assist other States Parties, appropriate legal protection, not harming theirs or others' heritage, drafting a Tentative List and giving assistance to international fundraising campaigns for the World Heritage Fund.

1.2.2 The World Heritage Committee

The World Heritage Committee is the governing body of the Convention as it takes decisions in matters relating to the Convention, including on World Heritage nominations. It consists of 21 States Parties to the Convention and is set up as a body of experts. The Convention stipulates that the Committee shall exist of 'persons qualified in the field of cultural or natural heritage' (Article 9.3). A Committee Member is elected for a period of six years, though the current agreement is to stay only for four years.¹⁰ The reason for this shorter term is to enable faster rotation of Committee Members among the 189 States Parties. There is no set number of seats according to the UNESCO electoral groups though the aim is to achieve an equal global representation of the States Parties in the Committee. Some States Parties were only out for two years before being elected again, like for example China and Egypt that went out in 2005 and came back in 2007. It resulted in a gentlemen's agreement that States Parties do not run again for the Committee until they have been out for at least four years, made definite by the 17th session of the GA in 2009 when it was included in the Rules of Procedure.

Some States Parties have served on the Committee for many (consecutive) years: Italy, for instance, between 1978 and 1985 and then again from 1987 to 2001; Mexico has served as Committee Member from 1985 to 2003 and from 2009 until 2013, and France has been on the Committee more than any other State Party, namely for a total of 25 years (from 1976 – 1985, 1987 – 1999 and from 2009 – 2013).

Membership of the Committee is not just an honorary position; the workload is immense. The annual meeting does not provide sufficient time for in-depth discussion of each issue. This is solved with (an increasing number of) working-groups during the 'free' hours of Committee sessions like lunch breaks, and with additional expert meetings throughout the year. The pros and cons of this will be discussed in chapter 3.

1.2.3 Advisory Bodies

The Committee is assisted in its work by independent Advisory Bodies. It works with the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) for cultural sites; IUCN for natural sites; and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) for training in the context of cultural sites. ICOMOS is a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), IUCN has both governmental and non-governmental members, whereas ICCROM is an Intergovernmental Organization (IGO). There is a variety in the level of staff and financial resources and the workload between the Advisory Bodies: there are, for example, more cultural than natural sites and nominations.

The Advisory Bodies are involved with the evaluation of nominations but also of the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. Their roles are defined in paragraph 31 of the *Operational Guidelines*:

- a advise on the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the field of their expertise;
- b assist the Secretariat, in the preparation of the Committee's documentation, the agenda of its meetings and the implementation of the Committee's decisions;
- c assist with the development and implementation of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List, the Global Training Strategy, Periodic Reporting, and the strengthening of the effective use of the World Heritage Fund;
- d monitor the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and review requests for International Assistance;
- e in the case of ICOMOS and IUCN evaluate properties nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List and present evaluation reports to the Committee; and
- f attend meetings of the World Heritage Committee and the Bureau in an advisory capacity.

ICOMOS and IUCN both have a national committee in the Netherlands and they organize Dutch heritage professionals. National members can only be asked to evaluate nominations or the state of conservation of a site outside their own country in order to prevent a conflict of interests though experts are selected from the same region, as they should have a proper understanding of the context of the heritage concerned.

1.2.4 The World Heritage Centre

The Committee is assisted in its work by a Secretariat, the World Heritage Centre which is based at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris and was established in 1992. The World Heritage Centre ensures, amongst other, the day-to-day management of the Convention, organizes the annual sessions of the World Heritage Committee, provides advice to States Parties, and informs the public.¹¹ One information channel is the website of the World Heritage Centre, which is part of the UNESCO website. The website not only lists all World Heritage sites; it also provides free access to the documents for and minutes of Committee sessions or expert meetings and other relevant resources. It is, however, not always easy to navigate through the website and to find the relevant documents.

The Centre is structured according to the regions of UNESCO, with units for Africa, Asia and Pacific, Arab States, Europe and North America, and Latin America and Caribbean. Other sections are a Special Projects Unit, a Policy and Statutory Meetings Section and a Communication, Education and Partnerships Unit. The Centre is headed by its Director Kishore Rao. At time of the 2007 *Management Audit of the World Heritage Centre* of the 87 people working at the Centre, 38 had a fixed post.¹²

1.2.5 The General Assembly of States Parties

The GA has two main functions: to determine the uniform percentage of financial contributions to the World Heritage Fund applicable to all States Parties, and to elect Members to the World Heritage Committee. The GA meets during the sessions of the General Conference of UNESCO, which is every other year.¹³ Other than during Committee meetings, each State Party can take the floor and has a vote at the GA.

The role of the GA with respect to policy development is getting more important, in recent years. This is partly in response to the increasing difficulty of getting on to the World Heritage

Committee, as well as to the desire of States Parties to have more input into the operation of the Convention. This will be discussed below, since it also regards the role of the Netherlands in the GA.

1.3 Nomination processes, long-term vision and Periodic Reporting

During the nearly forty years of the Convention's existence, many initiatives have been introduced in order to establish procedures and deal with the now rapidly developing World Heritage sector, and in particular with the ever-growing World Heritage List. Just like the heritage it aims to protect, the Convention as such is not static. Recent policy development is framed by the discussions about the Statement of OUV, the Global Strategy, and Periodic Reporting. These processes will be explained below.

1.3.1 Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage List is the best-known part of the World Heritage Convention. This List consists of 'properties forming part of the cultural heritage and natural heritage, as defined in Articles 1 and 2 of th[e] Convention, which it considers as having outstanding universal value in terms of such criteria as it shall have established'.¹⁴ The *Operational Guidelines* emphasise the international importance of those sites:

The cultural and natural heritage is among the priceless and irreplaceable assets, not only of each nation, but of humanity as a whole. The loss, through deterioration or disappearance, of any of these most prized assets constitutes an impoverishment of the heritage of all the peoples in the world. Parts of this heritage, because of their exceptional qualities, can be considered to be of "outstanding universal value" and as such worthy of special protection against the dangers which increasingly threaten them.¹⁵

In order to be inscribed on the List, a property first has to be placed on the State Party's Tentative List. A Tentative List is a national inventory of those properties which a State Party considers to have OUV, and thus suitable for inscription on the World Heritage List.¹⁶ Thus the basis of World Heritage sites is their OUV. To be considered of OUV, a property must meet one of the ten criteria as stipulated in the *Operational Guidelines* and meet the conditions of integrity and/or authenticity, and the protection and management system has to be adequate to ensure its safeguarding.¹⁷ These items should be clearly indicated in the SoOUV. The SoOUV has been included in the *Operational Guidelines* in 2005 and became operational in 2007, and thus became a prerequisite for every new site nomination. The existing sites on the World Heritage List were requested to draft a retrospective SoOUV in case of monitoring missions, or as part of the Periodic Reporting exercise, as will be explained in more detail in chapter 3.

1.3.2 Global Strategy

More cultural sites than natural ones have been inscribed on the World Heritage List. And within culture there is also an imbalance concerning the categories of heritage. There are, for example, many historic cities and cathedrals on the List. Furthermore, the European region dominates the World Heritage map. This resulted in an imbalanced List in terms of heritage type and geographical coverage. In 2012 the situation is as follows:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Cultural</i>	<i>Natural</i>	<i>Mixed</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>States Parties with inscribed properties</i>
Africa	47	35	4	86	9%	32
Arab States	67	4	2	73	8%	17
Asia and the Pacific	148	55	10	213	22%	32
Europe and North America	393	59	10	462	48%	50
Latin America and the Caribbean	90	35	3	128	13%	26
Total	745	188	29	962	100%	157

Table 1 – Overview World Heritage sites as displayed on their website¹⁸

To counteract the imbalance, the ‘Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List’ was established in 1994. It aims ‘both to correct the imbalances of the list between regions of the world, types of monuments and periods and pass from a purely architectural vision of cultural heritage of humanity to a much more anthropological, multifunctional and global vision’.¹⁹ In addition, it intends to:

[...] broaden the definition of World Heritage to better reflect the full spectrum of our world’s cultural and natural treasures and to provide a comprehensive framework and operational methodology for implementing the World Heritage Convention. [...] In an effort to further enhance the under-represented categories of sites and improve geographical coverage, the World Heritage Committee has recently decided to limit the number of nominations that can be presented by each State Party and the number of nominations it will review during its session.²⁰

Despite many references made to this Global Strategy, a clear definition of this Strategy was never given, resulting in various interpretations. Furthermore, there are no performance indicators, which makes it difficult to monitor the Global Strategy’s progress in relation to its aims.²¹ This problem was addressed by the 2009 GA, requesting an independent evaluation by UNESCO’s external auditor on the implementation of the Global Strategy and the Partnerships for Conservation initiative.²²

1.3.3 Periodic Reporting

Also important for the working of the Convention is the Periodic Reporting exercise, a mandatory self-assessment exercise by States Parties and the World Heritage sites. This exercise relates to the implementation of the Convention as its [Article 29.I](#) states:

The States Parties to this Convention shall, in the reports which they submit to the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on dates and in a manner to be determined by it, give information on the legislative and administrative provisions which they have adopted and other action which they have taken for the application of this Convention, together with details of the experience acquired in this field.

The Periodic Reporting serves four main purposes: ²³

- Assessment of the application of Convention;
- Assessment of the state of the OUV of the World Heritage sites;

- Provision of updated information about the sites and record changing circumstances;
- Regional co-operation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties.

The Periodic Reporting should thus be seen as a natural moment to take stock of the state of conservation of the World Heritage sites. It is an evaluation process for site managers and those responsible for World Heritage policy at a national level. The Periodic Reporting evaluates the legislation as well: is the legal framework still sufficient or has it even been improved? Periodic Reporting also provides a momentum for the States Parties of one region to meet and exchange on common issues, like dealing with new developments. Periodic Reporting thus shows the strength of the Convention as an international tool of co-operation.

The Netherlands participated with four sites in the first periodic reporting exercise for Europe and North America (2001-2006) which dealt with sites inscribed on the World Heritage List until 1997.²⁴ The Dutch Minister of Culture mentioned a relative positive state of conservation of the World Heritage sites in the Netherlands though the evaluation also demonstrated some financial bottlenecks. The case of the inner city of Willemstad was called 'worrisome'. As a result, the minister decided to look into ways of resolving this.²⁵ It demonstrates the positive impact the Periodic Reporting can have, provided that the questionnaires are taken seriously, and the answers not made up in order to make things appear better than they are. The next cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America will start in 2012.

1.4 Other UNESCO Conventions and UN Policies

The World Heritage Convention might be the only Convention to combine natural and cultural heritage, there are linkages with other Conventions and programmes.²⁶ Though the Convention focuses on tangible heritage, the vast majority of sites have intangible importance as well, with criterion (vi) of the World Heritage Convention reading: 'be directly or tangibly associated with events or living traditions, with ideas, or with beliefs, with artistic and literary works of outstanding universal significance'.²⁷

Since 2003, the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* offers another framework for heritage policies. Other relevant UNESCO Conventions are the 1954 *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict* (The Hague Convention) and its Protocols of 1954 and 1999, the *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property* (1970), and the *Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage* (2001).

The World Heritage Committee 'recognizes the benefits of closer co-ordination of its work with other UNESCO programmes and their relevant Conventions' and ensures appropriate co-ordination and information-sharing.²⁸ Within UNESCO a *Cultural Conventions Liaison Group* (CCLG) was established to work towards a more structured co-operation between these heritage-related Conventions.²⁹ Furthermore, heritage is also interpreted in the context of broader United Nations (UN) policies. Examples of this are the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Millennium Development Goals, and climate change debates.

Sometimes heritage is literally caught in the line of fire, by accident or on purpose, because of the significance of the heritage for the community. In March 2012, the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection (under the Second Protocol of the 1954 The Hague Convention) contained five World Heritage sites.³⁰ The problem of World Heritage as target in armed conflicts urged the Committee in 2010 to request the World Heritage Centre 'to report at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee on possible ways to encourage United Nations recognition for the protectors of World Heritage properties in conflict and post conflict zones, including through the use of blue/green berets or other appropriate insignia'.³¹

2 The Netherlands and World Heritage³²

2.1 The Netherlands and the Convention

The Kingdom of the Netherlands joined the World Heritage Convention relatively late, in 1992, and without much public debate.³³ However, since becoming a State Party, it has actively supported the Convention's aims, both in the national and international arenas.³⁴ The Dutch Minister of Culture stated in 2001 that it was due to the World Heritage Convention that people started to realise that they share a mutual responsibility for world heritage. He furthermore appreciated the obligation for the international community to co-operate.³⁵ In 1992, with a World Heritage List that was already quite weighted towards certain site categories, it was regarded as crucial to make a contribution to the List with new or under-represented categories.³⁶ In 2011 the Dutch Tentative List was reviewed. It now contains 10 sites, with three connecting themes: the Netherlands – Land of water; the Netherlands – Man-Made Country; and the Netherlands – a Bourgeois Society.³⁷ These themes also apply to the nine existing Dutch World Heritage sites.

2.1.1 Dutch points of view regarding World Heritage

Responsible for World Heritage in the Netherlands is the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science as it is responsible for UNESCO and its Conventions. The Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation is also involved, as the World Heritage Convention deals with both natural and cultural heritage. In 2001 it was decided that new nominations had to be approved by Parliament in order to create 'broad support and shared responsibility'.³⁸

As a rule, the Dutch Government regards the conservation of Dutch World Heritage primarily a responsibility of the owners and/or local/regional municipalities. Government responsibility lies mainly in the provision of relevant policies for the conservation of this extraordinary heritage.³⁹ In addition, Government is the go-between with UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee. In 2001 a Parliamentary note specified that the active commitment to this topic meant, for example, more attention to conservation, engagement with the public, enlargement of support and heritage education.⁴⁰ In 2004, World Heritage was one of the six priorities for the Netherlands in relation to UNESCO.⁴¹

On an international level, the Netherlands has demonstrated its commitment by establishing the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust (NFiT), and by its membership of the World Heritage Committee (2003-2007).⁴² In 2001 the Dutch minister of Culture stated that 'World Heritage means that natural and cultural heritage of the Netherlands can be valued beyond the national borders. This does not only result in a better understanding of the values and meanings of one's own heritage, but also in that of other countries'.⁴³ In 2010 World Heritage was mentioned again as an exemplary topic where international co-operation is essential.⁴⁴

World Heritage status resembles a double edged sword: it can be reason to act or to oppose specific interventions. This happened for example, in the context of nominations for World Heritage status or the review of the new Dutch Tentative List. Such implications of World Heritage status ensure that the issue of heritage, and World Heritage in particular, is being discussed. For instance, both in preparation of the nomination of the Wadden Sea and the Seventeenth-century Canal District of Amsterdam several public events were organised to raise awareness, inform the public, and to discuss the possible short and long term effects. The 2012 decision *not* to add the *Noordoostpolder* to the new Tentative List was taken after a decision by

the city council of the *Noordoostpolder* against placement on this list out of fear that World Heritage status would mean that nothing could change anymore.⁴⁵ The question of World Heritage Status also gets a lot of media attention, as for example the spread in *De Telegraaf* on the 18th of June 2011 on the occasion of the second Dutch World Heritage Weekend (always on the third weekend of June) or features on World Heritage in *Trouw* on every Saturday from 28 April until 30 June 2012. An earlier example from 2001 relates to the intention to create a harbour in the *Wijkmeerpolder*, part of the Defence Line of Amsterdam. The fact that it was now a World Heritage site was an important factor in the decision-making process with several institutions, both local and regional, being created to raise public awareness and to assist in the conservation of this particular World Heritage site.⁴⁶

2.1.2 Dutch World Heritage sites

To date nine sites in the Netherlands have been inscribed on the World Heritage List, and these are (with date of inscription):



- Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht (*Amsterdamse Grachtengordel*) (2010)
- The Wadden Sea (*De Waddenzee*) (2009)
- Rietveld Schröder House (*Rietveld Schröderhuis*) (2000)
- Beemster Polder (*Droogmakerij de Beemster*) (1999)
- D.F. Wouda Steam Pumping Station (*Ir. D.F. Woudagemaal*) (1998)
- Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour (*Willemstad Curaçao*) (1997)
- Mill Network at Kinderdijk-Elshout (*Molencomplex Kinderdijk-Elshout*) (1997)
- Defence Line of Amsterdam (*Stelling van Amsterdam*) (1996)
- Schokland and Surroundings (*Schokland en Omgeving*) (1995)

The Dutch World Heritage sites have different owners and management structures, and collaborate in a platform, *Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl*, which was established in 2000 with the financial support of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. In a letter to Parliament the Minister of Culture stated that this platform should play a key role in creating sustainable and broad support for World Heritage at the local and regional level and become a clearing house to exchange information and share experiences between site holders and with the Government.⁴⁷ In 2014 the *Stichting* will be evaluated.

2.2 Dutch experiences in the World Heritage Committee: some highlights⁴⁸

In 2003, at the 14th GA, the Netherlands was elected as a member of the World Heritage Committee for the first (and so far only) time. In 1993 the Netherlands had already tried to get on the Committee, but was unsuccessful.⁴⁹ A special project management group was established in support of the Dutch Membership of the Committee.⁵⁰ Prof. Dr. Rick van der Ploeg was the delegation leader. This group met at regular intervals in the Netherlands to discuss World Heritage issues and the Dutch stance on issues on the agenda of the annual Committee meeting.

The input of the Netherlands was guided by the Global Strategy, both in its internal policy and with respect to its input in the Committee. The priorities were outlined according to the then 4C's of the Global Strategy:

- Credibility of the World Heritage List;
- Conservation through development;
- Capacity Building;
- Communication to increase public awareness.

In 2007, during the last year of the Netherlands in the Committee, a fifth C was added: Community, for community involvement.

The Netherlands decided not to put forward any World Heritage nominations during its term in office (2003-2007) in support of the Global Strategy and that there should be a restrained Dutch nomination policy after 2007.⁵¹ Not everyone understood this approach, both within the Netherlands and in the Committee, but in the 2011 *Final report of the Audit of the Global Strategy* the Netherlands were especially mentioned in relation to this:

Consideration could be given to the example from several delegations [the Netherlands and United States] who decided not to present nominations during their terms of office. Provision in the Rules stating that States Parties on the Committee may present files, but these nomination requests should not be examined during their term of office, as already recommended in 1983 by the Chairperson of the Committee could also be considered.⁵²

It was a conscious decision from the Netherlands to stand for four years, and not six, in 2003. This has now become common practice. The *Operational Guidelines* of 2005 state that 'the term of office of Committee members is six years but, in order to ensure equitable representation and rotation, States Parties are invited by the General Assembly to consider voluntarily reducing their term of office from six to four years and are discouraged from seeking consecutive terms of office' as already briefly explained in chapter 1.⁵³ Ever since the elections in 2007 it was evident that those standing for six years would simply not be elected.

As a run up to the elections for the World Heritage Committee, the Netherlands organised in the spring of 2003 the international expert meeting 'Linking Universal and Local Values: Managing a

Sustainable Future for World Heritage'. This meeting focussed on the involvement of local communities in the management of World Heritage properties, and looked into opportunities for their sustainable economic and social development. The meeting was a good opportunity to demonstrate the interest and commitment of the Netherlands in relation to the World Heritage Convention. The outcomes of this conference were later published as World Heritage Papers N° 13.⁵⁴ The Netherlands used the outcomes of this meeting, such as the important role of site owners and custodians in the management of World Heritage sites, for their input in the discussions at the Committee. In the following sections we will briefly discuss these.

2.2.1 The first year: getting to know the process

The 28th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2004 (Suzhou, China) was the first year the Netherlands sat on the World Heritage Committee. One of the greatest differences between being a Committee Member and a State Party observer is of course that Committee Members actively participate in Committee discussions and have the right to vote. This requires a lot of (preparatory) work, and talking in formal and informal settings, like internal delegation meetings, meetings with other Committee Members and with States Parties. What hampered the preparation was the late availability of the Committee documents. The statutory deadline is six weeks before the start of the Committee session.⁵⁵ This problem of deadlines, and not just the one for Committee documents, affects not only Committee Members, but States Parties as well, since not meeting a deadline can mean a full year of delay. For example, if a new nomination has not been handed in before the first of February of a certain year, it will not be considered until the next year. The deadlines and time needed to respond in combination with the ever-increasing workload for all parties involved have been identified as a problem for the World Heritage Convention's sustainability.

During its first year in the Committee members of the Dutch Delegation also had to get to know each other, since it was the first time that they had worked so closely together, while representing various organizations. Initially, the Netherlands lacked an expert on natural heritage as the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation only became actively involved from 2005 onwards. The input of a natural heritage expert proved to be important and co-operation certainly intensified later on. The Netherlands did not have an archaeological expert in their delegation until the second year in the Committee either. This also proved to be important as it widens the scope of expertise in the delegation. Being a Committee Member, understanding processes of decision making, and being effective is something that had to be learned. The same goes for the functioning of the delegation. The second year certainly went smoother than the first: the workings of the Committee were clearer and the Dutch Delegation became better as a team.

In Suzhou the Committee debated the so-called Cairns decision of 2000, aimed at managing the workload for the World Heritage Centre, Committee, and Advisory Bodies, and to address the imbalance of the World Heritage List. It had set a limit to the number of new nominations: thirty per Committee session, with a maximum of two of the same State Party not including previously referred and deferred nominations. In Suzhou it was decided to amend the two nominations per State Party rule, were allowed provided that one was natural, was amended.⁵⁶ The fact that it had been possible to nominate two cultural sites in one State Party had increased the imbalance of the List according to the evaluation of the Global Strategy: 'the proportion of natural sites for nomination has since greatly diminished'.⁵⁷ The Committee also established an order of priorities in which nominations should be dealt with in case of more than 45 nomination files including the referred and deferred ones.⁵⁸ So far there has been no need to apply this list with priorities. In 2011 the decision was readjusted as follows:

Decides to re-establish the practice of examining two complete nominations per State Party per year provided that at least one of such nominations concerns a natural property or cultural landscapes.⁵⁹

This decision makes it possible to put forward two cultural nominations as a cultural landscape is a cultural nomination, sometimes a mixed one but never a natural one. Consequently, there is a risk that the cultural landscape category will only be used to get a second cultural nomination in.

2.2.2 Second year: African World Heritage Fund and climate change

Durban (South Africa) hosted the 29th session of the Committee in 2005. It was during this session that the initiative for an African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) was presented:

AWHF pursues the identification and preparation of African sites towards inscription on the World Heritage List; the conservation and management of sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List; the rehabilitation of sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the training of heritage experts and site managers. Through effective and sustainable management, Africa's world heritage sites will be catalysts in transforming Africa's image and act as a vehicle to stimulate economic growth and infrastructure development.⁶⁰

The Netherlands have supported the AWHF by financing the feasibility study and donating € 200.000 for the Funds (more about the AWHF in chapter 5).⁶¹

Climate change was the other main topic of debate in Durban. It is a universal phenomenon that affects World Heritage sites. Climate change crosses borders and the World Heritage Convention is an international instrument, but how to deal with pollution that comes from the other side of the border, or even from very far away, and affects your site? Who to hold responsible, or rather, is this even possible? The Committee requested a working group on this topic to look into World Heritage and climate change and to develop a strategy. In 2008 this resulted in a Policy document on the impacts of climate change on World Heritage Properties.⁶²

2.2.3 The third year: management issues and Periodic Reporting⁶³

In 2006 the 30th Committee meeting, taking place in Vilnius, Lithuania, examined *Result Based Management* (RBM) recommendations aimed at generating and using 'performance information for accountability reporting to external stakeholder audiences and for internal management learning and decision-making'.⁶⁴ A management audit was requested by the Committee 'in order to facilitate the development of the strategic plan for reinforcing the implementation of the *Convention*, and that no management structure changes at the World Heritage Centre should occur until the management audit is completed'.⁶⁵ This audit took place between November 2006 and April 2007 and was performed by Deloitte. Chapter 3 looks at some of the outcomes of this audit.

The outcomes of the first Periodic Reporting of the Europe and Northern America Region were discussed in Vilnius as well. They illustrated the necessity of strengthening international co-operation in this region, but also the growing awareness at the national level of the various States Parties concerned about the role of World Heritage sites in national heritage politics. The report demonstrated an increasing understanding of the necessity to clearly formulate the OUV

of a site, and highlighted certain challenges, like tourism, lack of resources and climate change. Chapter 3 will examine most of these issues. It was decided to initiate an overall year of reflection on the preparation of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting: what went well and what could be improved for the second cycle of Periodic Reporting? This has resulted, amongst other things, in a slight revision of the questionnaire.

2.2.4 The fourth year: the first deletion from the World Heritage List

In 2007 the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) was the first World Heritage site to be deleted from the World Heritage List. This happened in the last year that the Netherlands were on the Committee. During its 31st session at Christchurch, New Zealand, the Committee decided upon the deletion after a lengthy debate spanning several days. The main issue was a matter of principle: had the site irreversibly lost its OUV as had been formulated at the time of its nomination in 1996? If this was the case there would be no other option than to delete it; if not, placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger would have been the logical next step. While the protected area which comprised the World Heritage site had been reduced by 90%, the population of Arabian Oryx had significantly declined from 450 in 1996 to eight still alive in 2007. Extinction of the species was very likely and there were serious integrity issues including oil and gas exploration. This, according to IUCN, represented a loss of OUV and subsequently constituted a case for deletion of the site from the World Heritage List.

After lengthy debates, the Committee decided to delete the site from the World Heritage List. The decision emphasised the obligations of the States Parties under the Convention to protect and conserve their World Heritage. The Committee noted 'with deep regret that the State Party failed to fulfil its obligations defined in the Convention, in particular the obligation to protect and conserve the World Heritage property of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary'.⁶⁶ This decision is also interesting as the recommendation of IUCN concerning the nomination in 1994 was to defer the site in order for the State Party to 'enact legislation, implement a management regime for the area and define more precisely what the boundaries of a potential World Heritage site would be'.⁶⁷ And yet, despite these factors, it was inscribed on the List. This highlights the importance that only those sites which fully comply with all requirements should enter the List. The only other World Heritage site that has been deleted from the World Heritage List so far is Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) as will be discussed in chapter 4.

In 2007 the Netherlands organised an international expert meeting on *Benchmarks and Chapter IV of the Operational Guidelines*. Chapter IV of the *Operational Guidelines* concerns the development of 'criteria for determining adequate protection and management, the format for the state of conservation reports, standards for establishing and measuring benchmarks for conservation, and criteria for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and criteria for deletion of properties from the World Heritage List'.⁶⁸ The necessity to have a SoOUV for each World Heritage site was one of the nine recommendations from this meeting. This recommendation has later been adopted by the Committee as already indicated in chapter 1.

Since joining the Convention in 1992, the Netherlands has been an active State Party. The most visible perhaps is their time in the World Heritage Committee (2003 – 2007). The Netherlands was perceived as interested in content rather than form. Thomas Schmitt from the University of Bonn, who analysed decision-making on processes with respect to World Heritage and distinguished ten different attitudes and intellectual styles of the World Heritage Committee Members in 2006 and 2007, qualified the style of the Netherlands as:

- Interested in substantive issues rather than in diplomatic rules and forms (together with Norway);

- Placing emphasis on strict criteria for complying with norms for the protection of cultural and natural heritage and meeting of “benchmarks” (as were Norway, Canada and the USA);
- Placing emphasis on strict criteria for meeting the requirements of OUV in the case of new inscriptions (contrary to for instance India and Tunisia who were less strict on OUV).⁶⁹

3 Issues Relevant to the Future of the Convention

The World Heritage Convention is at an important crossroads. IUCN even speaks of a “tipping point” and states that ‘the focus of effort needs to begin to shift decisively away from a preoccupation with listing sites, to a convention that is primarily focused on maintaining the values of sites that have been listed’.⁷⁰ The problems that emerge from this trend will be discussed here.

In 2012 the World Heritage Convention celebrated its 40th anniversary. In light of this milestone, and the fact that the World Heritage List is nearing its 1000th inscription, the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2008 (Quebec City, Canada) adopted a *Strategic Action Plan and Vision* meant to guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention over the decade 2012-2022. At the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee (2012) the Committee decided to ‘implement the recommendations within its mandate’.⁷¹ The progress regarding the *Strategic Action Plan* will be reported to the General Assembly in 2013, which means that all States Parties have the opportunity to give their input and fine-tune the Action Plan.

The SWOT-analysis of the Convention mentions as its strengths the intergovernmental agreement that the Convention achieves and its near-universal membership. Budget limitations, differing interpretations of the criteria for OUV or management standards, as well as a lack of sufficient mechanisms for industry and private sector engagement are highlighted as its weaknesses. Threats are the emphasis on inscription as an end in itself and the increasing politicisation of decision-making processes; whereas the increase of civil society support and the strengthening of relationships with other international instruments are identified as opportunities.⁷² Five goals were formulated in the *Strategic Action Plan*:

World Heritage Goal 1: <u>Value</u> :	The Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage sites is maintained;
World Heritage Goal 2: <u>Credibility</u> :	The World Heritage List is a credible selection of the world’s cultural and natural heritage;
World Heritage Goal 3: <u>Quality</u> :	World Heritage maintains or enhances its brand quality;
World Heritage Goal 4: <u>Strategic</u> :	The Committee can address policy and strategic issues;
World Heritage Goal 5: <u>Effective</u> :	Decisions of statutory meetings are informed and effectively implemented. ⁷³

In addition, for the 35th World Heritage Committee session in 2011, certain key themes were identified that need attention in relation to the future of the Convention. These topics are:⁷⁴

- Disaster risk reduction;
- Sustainable tourism;
- Heritage impact assessment;
- Management effectiveness;
- Involvement of communities, NGOs, and other stakeholders in the management process;
- Strengthening legal and administrative frameworks at the national level;
- Better awareness of the World Heritage Convention in the general population;
- Better integration of World Heritage processes into other related planning mechanisms.

In the following we will focus on certain aspects of the above mentioned goals, and explain what is at stake.

3.1 Statement of OUV

As explained in chapter 1, the OUV signifies the values for which a property is inscribed on the World Heritage List. IUCN qualifies the SoOUV as ‘an essential reference point for monitoring, including Periodic Reporting, potential State of Conservation reporting (reactive monitoring), boundary modifications, changes to the name of a property, and possible inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger [and] the ultimate benchmark against which any decision regarding the possible deletion of a property from the World Heritage List should be weighed’.⁷⁵ Despite the centrality of the SoOUV, no unambiguous definition of OUV exists, and this continues to be a topic of debate within the Committee.

The first sites on the World Heritage List were inscribed without a concise description of their OUV. As a result, it can be difficult to accurately establish what has been inscribed, and thus what needs monitoring and safeguarding.⁷⁶ This relates, for example, to the exact geographical location of a site (what spaces are included, what are the boundaries), and the identification of elements that make up the World Heritage site. If a site ‘deteriorates’ for whatever reason it is difficult to determine what needs safeguarding and subsequently what corrective measures need to be established. This has resulted in lengthy discussion in the Committee and was one of the reasons to request a SoOUV for each site. However, it was not realized how much time and work this requires, the more so given the current timeframe of the World Heritage Committee and GA.

Nevertheless, it is essential to disseminate as wide as possible the importance of the SoOUV. One of the conclusions from the UNESCO missions to Liverpool in 2006, for example, was the necessity to ‘foster a broader awareness of the ‘Outstanding Universal Value’ of Liverpool’s World Heritage Site and its significance [...] in a local, national and international context’.⁷⁷ Drafting a SoOUV can be used to engage the local community and other relevant stakeholders, as a means to strengthen their understanding of what the World Heritage site is about, and allow for partnerships based on identification with the site. This might also facilitate a connection between the site and the surrounding environment, which might provide wider social and economic benefits. According to IUCN, such broad partnerships for conservation ‘are key to the success of the World Heritage Convention’.⁷⁸

3.2 Sustainability of the decision-making process and procedures

3.2.1 Time pressure

The time available at the World Heritage Committee sessions is used to its utmost capacity, resulting in working groups before the session, during the lunch break and after the session. Small delegations can be much stretched to cover everything since there may be multiple events and working groups to attend. On the other hand, the open-ended working groups in which the experts from States Parties observers can also participate in the discussion, are important. Nevertheless, the overfull agenda of the World Heritage Committee sessions does mean that all the participants are exhausted towards the end of the meeting, resulting in a tense atmosphere. Time off, somewhere in the process might be advisable, not only for people to regain their energy, but also for informal contact.

The time constraint also limits the options for in-depth discussion, essential to set out longer term strategic objectives and work on new initiatives. The World Heritage Convention thus is in

danger of getting stuck in short term measures rather than long term sustainable solutions. One way out seems to be putting more policy issues on the agenda of the GA. Although this might just move the problem to another forum, as was experienced during the last somewhat overburdened GA in 2011, it has the positive effect of enabling all States Parties to participate.

Another option is the expert meetings organized throughout the year. According to the evaluation, however, this has resulted in a 'plethora of expert meetings and consultative groups'. It would therefore be advisable to combine meetings where possible, provided that the level of expertise available for each separate topic can be maintained without turning the meetings into big events. This requires an accurate oversight of all the planned meetings. This is kept by the World Heritage Centre, being the secretariat of the Convention. The Centre is in turn dependent on the input from the States Parties. More guidance from the Committee on the priorities for policy development would be helpful as this could then serve as guidance for the topic of expert meetings, with meetings about a priority topic coming first, followed by other meetings. Furthermore, there is a danger that a knowledge gap will emerge between a large part of the World Heritage Community and an up-to-date few who attend expert meetings and Committee sessions. The World Heritage Centre's website can be used to reach all relevant parties but improvement is recommended in order to ensure that everyone can easily find the relevant documents. In 2011 the Committee also requested a study regarding an 'oversight and monitoring mechanisms for the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* to ensure that actions associated with priority policy issues are implemented'.⁷⁹ This mechanism could also assist in the setting of priorities for expert meetings.

Another attempt to improve the effectiveness of the Committee sessions, has been the decision by the Committee in 2011 to default to a minimum two-year cycle for the examination of state of conservation reports and for the discussion of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, except in urgent cases, as well as the introduction of an absolute limit on the number of reactive monitoring missions and state of conservation reports.⁸⁰ It remains to be defined what is 'urgent'. In addition, a remarkable rise in the number state of conservation reports should be noted: from 137 in 2005, to 177 in 2009.⁸¹ This demonstrates the increasing problems with conservation. And the total number of World Heritage sites on the List will only increase further every year. Discussing the conservation issues of World Heritage sites is core business of the Committee, as stipulated in paragraph 24b of the *Operational Guidelines*. ICOMOS notes a 'relative decline in the attention given to monitoring and the state of conservation reports during the sessions of the World Heritage Committee [though] this is a critical cornerstone of the working of the Convention'.⁸² And as IUCN aptly puts it, 'the credibility of the Convention will depend on the long term conservation and effective management of all World Heritage Sites'.⁸³

Finally, the Committee created more time in 2011 by deciding to have three regular (not extended) sessions of the Committee each biennium. In even and odd years there will be a meeting in a host country to discuss reports, budget, nomination and state of conservation reports; in the off year there will be another session at UNESCO Headquarters, immediately after the GA. This meeting will deal with strategic and policy issues and if necessary, with state of conservation reports needing urgent examination.⁸⁴

3.2.2 Politicisation

Recent years saw the emergence of a new problem with the current trend of inscribing sites on the World Heritage List that are recommended for deferral. A deferral means that the OUV is not quite established yet, and thus the nomination file does not contain a SoOUV which has been evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. Some statements have been drafted in the meeting, whereas other sites have been inscribed without such an SoOUV. This is not a positive development, as

the SoOuv is important for the conservation of the site as explained earlier. In the period 2005-2009, three sites were inscribed without a proper SoOuv. In 2010 in four cases the Statement was recorded provisionally, whereas in 2011 three nominations went from deferral to inscription.

In other cases, sites were inscribed against the advice of the Advisory Bodies. Such decisions of the Committee not to follow the scientific advice of the Advisory Bodies had occurred only twice in 2001, equalling 4%. In 2005 this was 15% and in 2010 44%.⁸⁵

A cause for concern in this respect is also the amendments to decisions, signed by a range of delegations, prior to a debate. On this trend, the Committee document on evaluation of the Global Strategy states in 2011:

[Numerous] testimonies concur in the denouncement of an increasing politicization of the decisions. Some delegates exercise pressure. [There is] the development of the practice of amendments to the decision proposals, signed by a series of delegations, and presented even before the opening of the debate on the presentation of the nomination file concerned. [They] were so flagrant in the opinion of many witnesses, at the 34th session (Brasilia) that they led to several delegations tabling an official protest. The Advisory Bodies voiced their concern in a joint communication addressed to the UNESCO Director-General.⁸⁶

Another kind of politicisation is the perceived conflict of interest of States Parties in the Committee that present their own new nominations to the World Heritage List, as mentioned before. The evaluation of the Global Strategy even noted a strong correlation between the States Parties in the World Heritage Committee and the number of nominated properties in their own territories:

Since [2003] the evolution has been erratic: 16.7 % in 2006 (Vilnius), 25 % in 2008 in Quebec, but 42.9 % in 2010 at the 34th session (Brasilia). The countries most present on the Committee have nearly four times as many properties inscribed than the average country.⁸⁷

The Netherlands, as mentioned before, has emphasised the importance of not nominating while serving on the Committee and tried several times, together with some other countries like Lebanon and St. Lucia, to get this established as a good practice, but it met with resistance. Gradually, the attitude seems to change, however, as the Committee in 2011:

Recommends Committee members consider refraining from bringing forward new nominations that might be discussed during their term serving on the Committee, without prejudice to nomination files already submitted, deferred or referred during previous Committee sessions, or nominations from least represented States Parties and that this provision be implemented on an experimental basis and be reviewed at its 38th session in 2014.⁸⁸

Next to experts, more diplomats play a role in the delegations. This is not a negative development per se as there are politically sensitive issues to deal with, but the crux of it all should be the expertise concerning World Heritage and not the political process.

3.3 Credibility of the List

The Credibility Goal in the *Strategic Action Plan* first and foremost refers to the imbalances between nature and culture, north and south, and an over-representation of certain categories

(historic city centres, cathedrals, etc.). This is well-known and not a recent issue. It was after all one of the reasons to develop the Global Strategy. It is the more disconcerting, that this imbalance does not significantly change for the better despite all the efforts. A recent development that could have a positive influence on the imbalance is the establishment of Category 2 Centres, as they work on regional capacity building and training (more in chapter 5).

A different way to work towards a more balanced List has been the request to States Parties already well represented on the World Heritage List to be very selective with new nominations, or even refrain from bringing forward new nominations for a certain period. This request was made at the Committee meeting in 2011.⁸⁹ At the same Committee session States Parties were invited to consider linking their nominations with a nomination from a State Party whose heritage is un(der)-represented.⁹⁰ This is not a new idea, as it is already mentioned in paragraph 59c of the *Operational Guidelines*, but now it was explicitly framed. Such twinning has to be an initiative supported and wanted by both parties and on equal footing. The Netherlands has some experience with the financial support of nominations from other countries via the Netherlands-Funds-in-Trust (chapter 6). Twinning could seriously be considered as well, both to develop new nominations as well as to enhance collaboration between existing sites, for instance between similar types of sites, like Amsterdam and another historic inner-city. It will contribute to the credibility of the List while strengthening its overarching goal: international co-operation.

The Netherlands will have to find such a balance between national and international ambitions, as was also recognised in the 2010 report by the commission that reviewed the Dutch Tentative List. With nine World Heritage sites the Netherlands has a fair representation on the List. Of the additional ten sites on the Tentative List, one has been submitted for review by the World Heritage Committee in 2013. The commission asked whether the Netherlands should actually still prepare new nominations considering the Global Strategy.⁹¹ Next to promoting twinning as an aspect of the preparation of own nominations, or work on a transboundary nomination, the Netherlands could consider not to put forward a new nomination every year, while also prioritizing such sites on the Tentative List that as a category are under-represented. The Dutch Tentative List provides various options in this respect.

3.4 Maintenance and conservation of sites

The focus of the World Heritage Convention should primarily be on the conservation of Listed sites, not inscription of new ones. Kishore Rao, the Director of the World Heritage Centre, states that the Convention is an instrument of international co-operation and assistance and thus 'requires the global community to accompany those States Parties that need such help throughout the entire World Heritage process, not only for getting sites of Outstanding Universal Value inscribed on the World Heritage List, but also for ensuring their sustained conservation'.⁹² The evaluation of the Global Strategy notes 'priority given to new nominations to the detriment of monitoring and conservation, keystone of the 1972 Convention'.⁹³ It even takes it a step further by claiming that 'the real issue is not the number of sites, but rather the capacity to ensure the effective conservation of those inscribed'.⁹⁴ It suggests therefore to 'reconsider the priority accorded to Preparatory Assistance in comparison to assistance for conservation and management and reinforces training in the field of management and conservation'.⁹⁵ Already as early as 1998 the heritage community emphasised that 'inscription is, and must be seen to be, part of a process, not an isolated event, preceded and followed by steps in an evolving continuum conceptualised as a very long term commitment'.⁹⁶

International co-operation in site management



Site management is a challenge at the Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia). The Borobudur got inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1991. Site management has been supported with US\$ 5,000 in international assistance and US\$ 42,000 in extra-budgetary funds up till 2009. The Netherlands is one of the States Parties that have given assistance via the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust which provided technical assistance (US\$ 35,000).⁹⁷ The Netherlands Funds-in-Trust became involved with the aim to:

[Assist] the Indonesian authorities in the implementation of the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee over the past years concerning the state of conservation of this World Heritage property, in consultation with all stakeholders. In particular, the mission will try to assist Indonesia's Ministry of Culture and Tourism in developing an Action Plan for improving the management system, including institutional and legal framework, for the protection of Borobudur Temple and its surrounding area, along with the recommendations from a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission of February 2006.⁹⁸

Initially there were more issues with the site, like the development of roads and other infrastructures, regulating informal commercial activities and tourism management.⁹⁹ In 2006, after a reactive monitoring mission, the State Party received concrete benchmarks with respect to the required improvements and in subsequent years the state of conservation has improved considerably. Though not all challenges are addressed yet and the Committee invited the State Party in 2009 to apply for international assistance in order to deal with them.¹⁰⁰

In 2011 the World Heritage Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to 'continue the reflection on the best way for the States Parties to engage in a constructive dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during the assessment of the nominations processes, and with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat during the reactive monitoring process'.¹⁰¹ This so-called upstream process aims to achieve an earlier interaction between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties, at the stage before the actual evaluation a new nomination, when thoughts are being formed about selecting sites for nomination, or even for the Tentative List. The Advisory Bodies have the broad picture based on an international overview. They are, however, also the party that evaluates each nomination. This, according to Rao, is 'one of the greatest ironies, because the Advisory Bodies are meant to be repositories of the best technical knowledge and expertise on the subject, yet are unable to share it freely with the States Parties for ensuring the success of the nominations!'.¹⁰² He is of the opinion that 'it is in our collective interest to identify and protect heritage of Outstanding Universal Value and hence, we have to all work together in this noble task'.¹⁰³ This is indeed a delicate balance. The upstream process is supported by the Advisory Bodies, as Tim Badman from IUCN confirms: 'when looking at new nominations, much more support should be provided earlier on to ensure a more effective listing process that meets countries' and communities' expectations'.¹⁰⁴ The Advisory Bodies can advise in the early stages of the Tentative List, or in the revision thereof, without guaranteeing the success of the final nomination. The Netherlands might want to consider such early involvement of the Advisory Bodies as well when their Tentative List needs a revision.

In 2011 the Committee also asked the support of States Parties to establish a comprehensive

‘state of conservation information system’ comprising information relevant to documenting and analysing trends in the state of conservation of all the sites on the List, to be collected by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Agreement on a uniform state of conservation information methodology ‘would be an essential first step to provide the required analytical studies and assist in site-management so as to avoid inappropriate development and to better address the factors affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of properties’.¹⁰⁵ It is essential that this new database is linked to existing databases, like those of the World Heritage Centre and aligned to initiatives like the case studies approach on which the Organization of World Heritage Cities is working.

World Heritage status as a tool for conservation



The Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah’s Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) became a World Heritage site in 2000 and was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2003 where it remained until 2009. The main conservation issues were the changing urban fabric due to demolition and uncontrolled constructions, and the overall absence of a management system. The site has received US\$ 29,800 in international assistance (for the preparation of the nomination file) and US\$ 52,000 in extra-budgetary funds, amongst which from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust.¹⁰⁶ Even though the site received assistance for the nomination file, with the contribution from the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust specifically earmarked for the management plan, management turned out to be an issue. The site received nine monitoring missions in seven years.¹⁰⁷ At the time of inscription, it was expected that this would enhance the protection of the Walled city of Baku.¹⁰⁸ This did not happen. Two years later the requested state of conservation report was not submitted and in 2003 Baku was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In 2007 some improvements in the state of conservation were noted.¹⁰⁹ In 2009 the site was taken of the List of World Heritage in Danger considering the ‘significant progress made in the implementation of the corrective measures’.¹¹⁰ But in the following year’s meeting the Committee expressed new concerns in relation to Baku’s state of conservation. The case of Baku illustrates that becoming a World Heritage site does not automatically enhance its protection, but requires commitment from all stakeholders.

3.4.1 Development and conservation

The state of conservation information system could be of great assistance in dealing with the conservation of sites. State of conservation reports illustrate recurrent weaknesses, such as:

- Responsibilities and planning: state of conservation reports from the State Party are not submitted or way too late;
- Setting: sites may be surrounded by ambiguous or no buffer zones;
- Formal and legal framework: lack of or inadequate legal instruments to protect the OUV, no Statement of OUV, lack of or non implemented management system;
- Site development: new developments might threaten the OUV and need a Visual Impact study and/or Environmental Impact assessment;
- Sustainability: sites often require risk and disaster preparedness programmes, a capacity building programme for managers and other stakeholders, and a policy with respect to tourism.

A 2010 analysis for the World Heritage Committee of the state of conservation trends showed that management and legal issues were the number one concern. In the period 2005 – 2009 'between 83% and 98.9% of properties facing *Management and legal issues* were threatened by the lack of a management plan or system (nearly 100% in 2008)'.¹¹¹ Development and Infrastructure related concerns are the second major issue. During an expert meeting in Dakar, Senegal (13-15 April 2011) this tension between development and conservation was noted as a particular problem for World Heritage properties. The meeting emphasised the importance of proper assessments 'to identify possible impacts of proposed developments on the OUV of properties'.¹¹² The *Operational Guidelines* require such assessments in relation to (new) development and World Heritage sites. Paragraph 172 reads:

The World Heritage Committee invites the States Parties to the Convention to inform the Committee, through the Secretariat, of their intention to undertake or to authorize in an area protected under the Convention major restorations or new constructions which may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Notice should be given as soon as possible (for instance, before drafting basic documents for specific projects) and before making any decisions that would be difficult to reverse, so that the Committee may assist in seeking appropriate solutions to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is fully preserved.

Paragraph 172 thus leaves it to the State Party to evaluate what can be considered a 'major restoration', whether or not the restoration or the 'new construction' may affect the OUV, and whether the World Heritage Centre has to be informed. It can happen that a State Party considers paragraph 172 not applicable for a certain development, whereas the Centre or the Advisory Bodies might see it otherwise. Interested persons or NGOs can also challenge the State Party by alerting the World Heritage Centre of a threat to the OUV. The developments in the direct vicinity of the Tower of London with the development of the Shard of Glass (a building 310 metres tall), for instance, was brought to the attention of the World Heritage Centre by someone from the public.¹¹³ The Centre responded with a monitoring mission.

According to IUCN (2009), a proper application of paragraph 172 would help to prevent situations where information regarding proposed developments is presented at the World Heritage Centre long after the decision has in favour of the development. However, time is a bottleneck: the Committee only gathers once a year whereas developments happen throughout the entire year, and delay may not be a realistic option. After submission of the proposal, the Centre asks the relevant Advisory Body for advice, which can take quite some time and for the State Party may not comply with all kind of deadlines to be met in relation to planning and building permissions. Even urgent procedures are still time consuming.

Good ways of establishing a potential impact on the OUV of a site due to new developments are the application of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). The EIA checks the possible positive or negative impact of the proposed project on the environment, together with the social and economic aspects, whereas the HIA gives clarity on the potential impact on what is called the 'heritage values'. As such, HIA is an essential element in the EIA. Since both approaches to impact study are relatively new in the World Heritage context, the participants at the Dakar meeting expressed the need for clearer guidelines.¹¹⁴ It was suggested to establish clear criteria when impact assessments should be sent for review to the World Heritage Centre and that this should be incorporated into paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.¹¹⁵ Practical assistance in this context could also be the *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties* by ICOMOS.

The Netherlands has implemented in its planning processes the European Directive for Environmental Impact Assessment (*milieueffectrapport / MER*), which includes HIA. However,

not all developments or spatial modifications need an EIA. In such cases voluntarily applying the EIA can be a useful tool to make conscious decisions on the effect of the development on the OUV of the site at stake. Furthermore, it is essential that all Dutch World Heritage sites have a proper monitoring system in place to allow for early detection of possible impacts on the OUV of the properties as mentioned above. The second Periodic Reporting exercise provides a good momentum to define such systems for all sites.

3.4.2 Best practice

The impact of development on the visual values of heritage has been much discussed over the years. The construction of, for example, wind turbines along the coast can have an impact on the OUV of a site much further inland when the view from this place, or the open landscape, is an essential part of this OUV. This was recently the case with the Historic Centre of Brugge (Bruges), a World Heritage site in Belgium. The possible construction of two wind turbines in the proximity of Brugge was a reason for a (visual) impact study. From several places in the city the wind turbines turned out to be visible above the historic buildings. ICOMOS therefore considered that this project would have a negative impact on the OUV.¹¹⁶ The State Party has subsequently abandoned the construction plans.

In some instances the Advisory Bodies are criticized for being too rigid in their recommendations, especially in relation to developments in the surroundings of a World Heritage property. These can be assessed in different ways and views on what may be acceptable. Being explicit about how a construction which can be seen from, or in front of, the World Heritage site has an impact on the OUV of that site is important. English Heritage developed a 'technique for Qualitative Visual Assessment which will enable a more objective and generally acceptable assessment of impact of proposals to be made'.¹¹⁷ The Netherlands is a densely populated country with a dynamic relation between economics and the conservation of heritage. It is currently working on new nominations in urban areas. Being an active State Party to the Convention facilitates involvement with the development of monitoring and evaluation systems. It is to the benefit of the State Party to have systems they can work with as the Committee can, and does, become involved with the conservation of individual sites.¹¹⁸ The United Kingdom had to submit a state of conservation report concerning the Tower of London in 2006, and the site has been closely followed by the Committee ever since.

The Convention's positive achievements represent potential that is not used to full advantage. The Convention can function as a motivator, by presenting good practices with respect to conservation and site management, instead of the emphasis on what goes wrong. Young suggests that 'World Heritage Sites are influential levers for change and development of sustainable communities globally. They provide a basis for local and international co-operation, knowledge transfer, capacity-building, education and citizenship'.¹¹⁹ These receive more attention, especially by means of the recent World Heritage resource manuals like *Preparing World Heritage Nominations* (2010) and *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage* (2010), or the manual on site management to be published in 2012 or 2013. This trend of sharing experiences and connecting sites should be reinforced especially as what is out there is not always well known or easily accessible.

The World Heritage Centre has launched a one-off initiative for the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention in 2012. This initiative called upon States Parties to propose World Heritage properties in their country that they regard as an example of successful and sustainable heritage management. A selection committee will decide on which sites are indeed such examples, as a means to highlight the potential of World Heritage sites. This has to be carefully communicated, though, since it should not be seen as a list within the World Heritage List.

3.4.3 Tourism

Tourism is a central concern for the management of heritage sites. First there is the expected economical revenue World Heritage status will generate; in many cases this is mentioned as a reason for putting forward World Heritage nominations. Heritage tourism is supposed to increase from eight to twelve percent per year on average,¹²⁰ but these figures are contested. Pricewaterhouse Coopers (2007) has demonstrated that especially for existing World Heritage sites, especially those that were inscribed relatively early, the impact on growth rates of tourism is minimal. Neither does tourism necessarily imply that the sites themselves get more income, as IUCN states:

Enormous energy is expended by governments, UNESCO, and IUCN during the nomination process, however much less when it comes to actual management of the property. Field managers are often frustrated by the fact that World Heritage status increases public visitation and management needs but does not necessarily increase revenues needed to manage increases in tourism.¹²¹

Another issue is the potential negative aspect of tourism. The large influx of tourists can add a considerable challenge to the conservation of the site. With mass travel come chain hotels and restaurants.¹²² This might threaten the local and unique feel of the place. An example of a site that has to cope with these challenges is Angkor (Cambodia). The international awareness campaign raised a lot of funds for the site, but also interest, resulting in a significant increase of visitors: 'hundreds of thousands of visitors climb over the ruins of Angkor every year, causing heavy deterioration of original Khmer stonework'.¹²³ The same goes for the Galapagos Islands. The fear is that the site is in danger of losing the heritage status by mass tourism damage.¹²⁴ The dilemma is between short term profits which might be at the expense of the site or long term-sustainable profits. One result of such mass tourism is that guidebooks like the *Lonely Planet* are 'urging readers to visit some of the earth's great gems before they are inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage list'.¹²⁵

A third issue related to tourism is its benefits for the local community. For instance, Virunga National Park (DRC), where the mountain gorillas attract many visitors, involved the local communities in the benefits and thus ensuring their involvement conserving this unique site:



Thirty percent of the income received through gorilla tourism is re-distributed to the local communities to fund social projects such as school construction and to cover running costs of the health centers. A new school and health centre were created at the park headquarters in Rumangabo, partly with donor assistance, but also using some of the tourism receipt. The facilities are accessible to both park staff and the local communities. This initiative generated a strong support from the local communities.¹²⁶

Another example is from a site in the United Kingdom, where the World Heritage label did generate economic benefits for the local communities:

Following the designation of Blaenavon Industrial Landscape in Wales as a World Heritage Site in 2000, property values in the area increased over 300% in 5 years, above the UK average. Other benefits included a 100% rise in visitor levels over 5 years, over 100 jobs in construction created annually, 65 FTE jobs in tourism created or safeguarded, the outworn fabric of 500 properties made good, 75% of town centre dereliction made good, new businesses created and significant improvements in the environment and local facilities.¹²⁷

As tourism is frequently mentioned in the state of conservation reports as a possible negative influence on the OUV, a sustainable tourism strategy is needed, especially as the tourism industry is expected to expand further over the coming years. Hence the request by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in 2010 for 'a new and inclusive programme on World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism, with a steering group comprising interested States Parties and other relevant stakeholders'.¹²⁸ The concept Sustainable Tourism Strategy, presented for adoption by the World Heritage Committee in 2012, reads:

If undertaken responsibly, tourism can be a driver for preservation and conservation of cultural and natural heritage and a vehicle for sustainable development. But if unplanned or not properly managed, tourism can be socially, culturally and economically disruptive, and have a devastating effect on fragile environments and local communities.¹²⁹

The strategy aims for a holistic approach consisting of both bottom-up and top-down measures, with the following objectives:¹³⁰

- Integrate sustainable tourism principles into the mechanisms of the World Heritage Convention;
- Strengthen the enabling environment by advocating policies, strategies, frameworks and tools that support sustainable tourism as an important vehicle for protecting and managing cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value;
- Promote broad stakeholder engagement in the planning, development and management of sustainable tourism that follows a destination approach to heritage conservation and focuses on empowering local communities;
- Provide World Heritage stakeholders with the capacity and the tools to manage tourism efficiently, responsibly and sustainably based on the local context and needs;
- Promote quality tourism products and services that encourage responsible behaviour among all stakeholders and foster understanding and appreciation of the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and protection of World Heritage.

In line with UNESCO and the World heritage Centre, the World Bank also recognizes the importance, potential and threats of tourism:

Cultural heritage and sustainable tourism are inherent elements of the Bank's development assistance to its clients in the developing world. Promoting conservation and reuse of heritage assets for sustainable tourism helps to strengthen the economy beyond the service sector including providing incentives for job creation, urban upgrading, physical improvement of urban environment, general infrastructure, education, and the manufacturing industry.¹³¹

Early and proper long term planning is vital for a positive impact of World Heritage status on the socio-economic situation of a property. Sometimes it is not about more tourists, but about another kind of tourist. Amsterdam, for example, has more than enough tourists. It would like, however, to attract the more culturally interested ones, as these 'tend to be higher-value customers and tend to spend more, stay longer, and purchase more'.¹³² The World Heritage Committee actually asked the Netherlands and Germany to prepare and implement an overall Tourism Development Strategy for the Wadden Sea 'that fully considers the integrity and ecological requirements of the property and that provides a consistent approach to tourism operations in the property'.¹³³

3.5 Training and capacity building

Training and capacity building are essential to equip well-informed and qualified heritage professionals, a prerequisite for the sustainable conservation of sites. The various kinds of training aim at different target groups and stakeholders, appreciating their level of education and catered to their interests and needs. Techniques offered are tools on the internet, meetings or guidelines and manuals. It is also necessary to educate decision takers and influence them to take decisions which respect OUV.

A training programme should contain basic training about the Convention, what it is and what it sets out do. Even for those sites already inscribed on the List it is important to keep in mind what it is all about: staff tends to change over time, government officials rotate, site managers change, and communities transform. Since the Convention is not a static entity, it is important that all stakeholders are aware of changes and how these affect them. The transmission of knowledge to site managers deserves special attention. It is important to ensure the passing on of knowledge from national to site level and vice versa.

Training is relevant not only at national, regional or site-levels, but also at international level. Participants at the expert meeting on decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the World Heritage Convention (15-17 December 2010, Manama, Bahrain) considered 'capacity building and preparatory meetings to improve the effectiveness of decision-making' in relation to the Committee essential. They stated that 'both the Chairperson and Rapporteur [of the World Heritage Committee] needed to be well briefed in relation to their roles and the tools at their disposal to manage the discussion and decision-making process'.¹³⁴

Training is also part of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Europe and North America that will be launched this year. UNESCO's *Global Training Strategy for Cultural and Natural Heritage* looked into state of conservation reports and warned for the isolation of heritage concerns from other sectors even though more and more issues from outside the World Heritage site are having an impact on the site.¹³⁵ They stressed the need to strengthen the knowledge of all stakeholders about World Heritage. Effective capacity building should:

- Strengthen the knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviour of people with direct responsibilities for heritage conservation and management;
- Improve institutional structures and processes through empowering decision-makers and policy-makers;
- Introduce a more dynamic relationship between heritage and its context and, in turn, greater reciprocal benefits by a more inclusive approach, such that missions and goals are met in a sustainable way.¹³⁶

By synchronizing capacity building with the Periodic Reporting cycle relevant regional organizations could be asked to participate in the Periodic Reporting exercise. The training needs brought forward through the Periodic Reporting exercise will lead to a training strategy per (sub)region. It should furthermore lead to the development of a national capacity building strategy based on the specific national and property based capacity building needs.¹³⁷ If thus in 2014 the Periodic Reporting exercise for Europe and North America is ready, in 2015 the capacity building process will be launched and implemented between 2016 and the third cycle of Periodic Reporting. In this context, the Netherlands will need to reflect on its specific training needs in order to be able to provide an active input in the regional strategy and thus develop a strategy as relevant as possible for the Netherlands.

4 The List of World Heritage in Danger

Generally it is a long procedure before a World Heritage site is placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Most state of conservation issues discussed by the World Heritage Committee do not result in such a placement. Placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger is a way of addressing a threat, in case other methods, like recommendations or international assistance do not work. One of the highest priorities of the *Strategic Action Plan* is to 'fully use the mechanism of In-Danger listing' and as a high priority to 'allocate a part of accumulated funds to conservation; estimate the funding needs for the safeguarding of properties in danger [and] elaborate a conservation programme for properties requiring assistance from the international community'.¹³⁸

Often it starts with a reactive monitoring, which is a report on the state of conservation of the World Heritage site under threat. This report should assist in identifying the measures which should be taken to prevent the deletion of the site from the List.¹³⁹ If the situation is deemed serious enough, the site will be proposed for the List of World Heritage in Danger, whereas in case immediate action is needed and it is not possible to wait till the upcoming Committee session, the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (to which we will return below) will be applied. In general, a mission will take place before it is placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Only if all actions have failed, and the OUV is irreversibly damaged, the site will be deleted from the World Heritage List altogether. Article 11.4 of the Convention stipulates this as follows:

[the List of World Heritage in Danger may] include only such property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage as is threatened by serious and specific dangers, such as the threat of disappearance caused by accelerated deterioration, large-scale public or private projects or rapid urban or tourist development projects; destruction caused by changes in the use or ownership of the land; major alterations due to unknown causes; abandonment for any reason whatsoever; the outbreak or the threat of an armed conflict; calamities and cataclysms; serious fires, earthquakes, landslides; volcanic eruptions; changes in water level, floods and tidal waves. [...].

The objective of this list is to mobilise the international community and identify needs and actions necessary to prevent the irreversible loss of the OUV.¹⁴⁰

4.1 Issues that can lead to placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Various reasons can be mentioned why a site can be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger (see Annex II for a complete overview of all sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, for how long and the reasons why). These are divided in so-called ascertained and potential dangers. Ascertained dangers indicate specific and proven imminent dangers in relation to the OUV, like serious deterioration of materials, structures or urban environment, significant loss of authenticity or cultural significance, decline in the population of the species, deterioration of the natural beauty or scientific value or human encroachment on the boundaries threatening the integrity of the property. Potential dangers are those threats that can have irreversible impact on the OUV, like threatening effects of town planning, outbreak of armed conflict, climate change or modification in legal status.¹⁴¹ With respect to the 38 sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger anno 2012, the following threats are dominant: political instability, adverse refugees impact, management problems, mining, looting, poaching and lack of legal

protection. It is essential to develop mechanisms to deal with these threats. And this is something the international community has to do as international challenges require international solutions.

4.2 Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger

Properties are inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger either at the request of the State Party and after approval by the World Heritage Committee, or by decision of the Committee after a recommendation by the Advisory Bodies following a monitoring mission. Some countries apply for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as they hope that this will attract both national and international attention and assistance. There is no guarantee that this will actually happen, however, they regard this list as the conservation tool it is intended to be.

Requesting placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger

A recent example of voluntary placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger is the Everglades National Park of the United States. This site was placed on this list in 2010 at the request of the State Party because of ‘serious and continuing degradation of its aquatic ecosystem’.¹⁴² It was the second time the Everglades were included in the List of World Heritage sites in Danger. The first time had been a long period, from 1993 to 2007, following damage caused by Hurricane Andrew and a marked deterioration in water flows and quality resulting from agricultural and urban development.¹⁴³ In 2010 the United States requested experts from UNESCO and IUCN to develop ‘a desired state of conservation with a view to removing the property from the Danger List as quickly as possible’.¹⁴⁴

Most States Parties, however, try to resist against placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger as they perceive it as a public statement with respect to their supposed inability to protect these properties, which can bring them internal problems as well. Or as Schmitt puts it: ‘inscription on this list would mean trouble for the national ministry, raise questions in the country, and affect the country’s international reputation’.¹⁴⁵ As a result, already the threat of danger listing is a powerful tool to get States Parties to address conservation challenges; in cases they can actually do something on their own. This is often not the case, for example, with the impact of natural disasters. Nevertheless it should be emphasised that placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not a punishment, even though it is too often seen as such. For the list to indeed work as a conservation tool is it vital that placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not considered as a sanction.

Politics and the List of World Heritage in Danger

The political aspect of the List of World Heritage in Danger was emphasised by the statement of the Government of Ecuador when the Galapagos Islands were removed from this list in 2010. It welcomed this step as the result of a successful lobby campaign.¹⁴⁶ IUCN, the relevant Advisory Body, was not in favour of removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger but the Committee decided differently by a

majority vote (14 to five, with two abstentions).¹⁴⁷ Among the opponents to the removal from the list were also some conservationists as they feared that this would be seen as a signal of 'a relaxation of vigilant management and conservation efforts'.¹⁴⁸ The *Economist* called it 'only one of several signs that the UN agency is bending its own rules under pressure from member states'.¹⁴⁹

According to Christina Cameron, Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage and a World Heritage expert, the List of World Heritage in Danger is 'meant to be a published priority list of projects with cost estimates that could be used to mobilize international co-operation and major donors' and that 'the negative aura around the In Danger listing process means that the In Danger List is far from capturing the full extent of seriously endangered sites'.¹⁵⁰ This underlines that something needs to be done to improve the workings of the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The discussion whether or not a site can be inscribed on this list without the consent of the State Party recurs at the World Heritage Committee meetings. Already in 2002 the legal advisor had written that 'the *Convention* does not explicitly require that the State Party concerned present a request for the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger or give its consent to such inscription'.¹⁵¹ However, a lot of States Parties, and their legal advisors, do not agree. It is up to the Committee in the end to decide on inscribing a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Occasionally a site gets inscribed on the World Heritage List and at the same time on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This was the case with the Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan), Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) and the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile). In most of these cases, an armed conflict, political instability, or a natural disaster is part of or caused the threat. Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the request of the State Party. It wanted the assistance of the international community for tackling the main conservation issues, namely the extremely fragile nature of the industrial buildings, lack of maintenance over some forty years, vandalism due to looting of re-usable materials, and damage caused by the wind.¹⁵²

International assistance for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger



Chile asked, and was granted, international assistance for the protection and consolidation of the Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works and an international expert meeting on the conservation of wood and metal structures for a total amount of US\$ 60,000. International assistance can considerably vary. Angkor received US\$ 142,193 as international assistance and US\$ 52 million in extra-budgetary funds up to 2010. Such extra-budgetary funds were not found, unfortunately, for Humberstone. The Netherlands Funds-in-Trust did provide US\$ 20,000 preparatory assistance in 2003-2004 but this does not count as an extra-budgetary contribution as the site was not a World Heritage site yet. In 2011, the site still lacked a management plan. However, the Committee also noted the significant progress made in the stabilization of key structures, while stressing the importance of securing funds. It remained concerned about the protection of the integrity of the property.¹⁵³ Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works does have corrective measures and a timeframe, and is working on the establishment of a desired state of conservation for removal but yet finds it difficult to get enough funds to seriously tackle the conservation problems it is facing. These problems increased after the earthquake in 2010, which meant reallocating the funds. The timeframe for

conservation activities even states that progress is dependent of funds available.¹⁵⁴ Hopefully once the desired state of conservation for the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger is established, the site will have a stronger appeal to the international community to be involved in its conservation.

The *Operational Guidelines* stipulate that the Committee shall develop, and adopt, as far as possible, in consultation with the State Party concerned, a Desired State of Conservation for the Removal (DSOCR) of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, with a programme for corrective measures.¹⁵⁵ The DSOCR should clearly state which actions are needed in order to get the property off this list. A DSOCR has four key elements: indicators to monitor recovery; a rationale for the indicators selected; a method of verification for each indicator; and a timeframe for the implementation of both the corrective measures and the reaching the desired state of conservation.¹⁵⁶ Through the DSOCR the Committee gives States Parties a clear goal to work towards, while stressing the temporary nature of being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. During the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee (2006) the Delegation of India noted that 'one of the difficulties faced by the Committee when a site was really in danger was opposition by the State Party concerned [and] once a site had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it was extremely difficult to remove it'.¹⁵⁷ In order to mobilise international support and engage the active involvement of the responsible government, the threats to a site must be well defined, as well as the strategy to solve the problem, the financial implications and the time frame for action. This will enable the State Party to know what needs to be done, as the solution might also be political or implying the withdrawal of a development proposal. In case of conservation problems, a DSOCR can also help in attracting sponsors, as they select concrete projects with clear budget implications and focused outcomes that allow them to know what they are committed to.

Compared to other lists with heritage sites that face conservation challenges, it is surprising that a place on the List of World Heritage in Danger has such a negative stigma. The so-called Watch Sites of the World Monuments Fund for example, do not have a negative aura. Other than the List of World Heritage in Danger, however, is that the Watch Sites mechanism is a self-selecting process where the property has an active say. Since the World Monument Fund is successful in fundraising, being placed on their 'Watch list' is likely to result in financial support.

Fund raising for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger



When Angkor (Cambodia) in 1991 was in the process of inscription on the World Heritage List, UNESCO launched at the same time the "Save Angkor" campaign to mobilise the international community. The site was inscribed in 1992 under special circumstances, considering it was under temporary administration of the UN. The Committee decided 'to waive some conditions required under the Operational Guidelines' in order to inscribe Angkor, but it 'stressed that this action was not to be taken as setting a precedent for the inscription procedure'.¹⁵⁸ It guaranteed protection of the site for a three-year period (1993 - 1995) and decided to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger as well 'in order to deal with the urgent problems of conservation quickly and effectively'.¹⁵⁹ Thus danger listing was used as a conservation tool though it remained on this list until 2004. Christina Cameron notes that 'UNESCO played a critical role in salvaging the site from the ravage of war, mobilising international support and bringing expertise to Cambodia'.¹⁶⁰ This call for international co-operation was imperative to save the site and was quickly followed by international action. The positive aspect of danger listing for Angkor is highlighted by

Philippe Delange, UNESCO Culture Programme Specialist, when he states that ‘being on the in-danger list also brought advantages, especially in terms of international assistance’.¹⁶¹ Not only 16 countries in 4 continents are involved, there has also been international assistance from, amongst others, World Monuments Fund, CIDEV/COFRAS/CMAC, Halo Trust and l’Association des Amis d’Angkor. The international assistance has been co-ordinated by an International Co-ordinating Committee which is co chaired by France and Japan. UNESCO is the secretariat.¹⁶² This illustrates that a very specific involvement of UNESCO and a strong commitment by the international community can indeed have a positive impact on the state of conservation of the site. That this international awareness can also have a negative side to it by means of an increased tourism which in turn can have a negative impact on the OUV of the site has already been discussed in chapter 3.

Next to the earlier mentioned suggestions of improving the working of the List of World Heritage in Danger, it has been suggested to change the name of this list, for instance into ‘List of International Assistance’ as its present name has negative connotations and emphasises the danger aspect rather than the opportunities. Christina Cameron proposes to label the list as the ‘List of Sites for Priority Funding’. In both proposals for another name the association is more neutral, not focussing on the danger. However, that would not cover sites that do not need financial support but are under another type of threat, like the Cologne Cathedral whose OUV is threatened by high-rise building projects.¹⁶³ However, changing the name of the List of World Heritage in Danger would imply changing the Convention, which is generally regarded as not possible in practical terms as all States Parties have to agree. Nevertheless, although changing the name might seem, and to a certain extent is a cosmetic change, the psychological aspect of naming (and blaming) should not be underestimated.

4.3 Removal from the World Heritage List

When the OUV of a World Heritage site is irreversibly damaged, the Committee may decide to delist the property. A property can be delisted:

Where the property has deteriorated to the extent that it has lost those characteristics which determined its inclusion in the World Heritage List; [and] where the intrinsic qualities of the property were threatened by human activities at the time of its nomination and where the necessary corrective measures have not been taken within the time proposed.¹⁶⁴

The World Heritage site of Dresden Elbe Valley was delisted in 2009. It had only been on the World Heritage List for a relatively short time, as it was inscribed in 2004. It was already noted in the established criteria that change could put pressure on the OUV of the site:

Criterion (v): The Dresden Elbe Valley is an outstanding example of land use, representing an exceptional development of a major Central-European city. The value of this cultural landscape has long been recognized, but it is now under new pressures for change.¹⁶⁵

Two years after this inscription, in 2006, the Dresden Elbe Valley was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This was due to a four-lane bridge construction project in the property. That year the Committee noted with great concern that the construction project of this “Waldschlösschen-Bridge” would irreversibly damage the values and integrity of the property.¹⁶⁶ It however also mentioned ‘with satisfaction that the national authorities have commissioned a visual impact study’ and decided:

to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, with a view to considering delisting the property from the World Heritage List at its 31st session in 2007, if the plans are carried out.¹⁶⁷

The only option for removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger List was to halt the bridge project.¹⁶⁸ However, the citizens of Dresden had already decided in favour of the bridge in a referendum in 2005, and though the city council decided to stop the requests for contracts regarding the bridge in 2006, the court ruled in 2007 that the work should proceed until further hearing could be held in 2008.¹⁶⁹

To reach the final decision to delist the site took several years. Between 2006 and 2009 the Dresden Elbe Valley was discussed at every session of the World Heritage Committee, as is the case for all sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger List. The final decision at the 33rd session in 2009 stated with deep regret that the State Party was unable to fulfill its obligations defined in the Convention to protect and conserve the OUV of the Dresden Elbe Valley.¹⁷⁰ It had been evident that the State Party took this issue very serious, and the Committee acknowledged ‘the commitment of the State Party to fully explore and exhaust all options towards preserving the Outstanding Universal Value inherent in elements of the Dresden Elbe Valley’.¹⁷¹ German magazine *Der Spiegel* called the decision a disgrace: ‘the disgrace is now official: Dresden Elbe Valley is no longer World Heritage’. It reported the *Bundesbauminister* as saying ‘this is a black day’.¹⁷² It had turned into a national dilemma with even writer Günter Grass urging in an open letter to *Bunderskanzlerin* Angela Merkel to intervene and save the heritage.¹⁷³

Problematic as it may be, deletion of sites from the World Heritage List also upholds the credibility of the World Heritage Convention. So far this happened to two sites only, the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) in 2007 discussed in section 2.2.4 and the above mentioned Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) in 2009. The delisting of sites without OUV is mentioned as a high priority in the *Strategic Action Plan* and maybe should get the highest priority, as it is directly linked to the credibility of the Convention. However, delisting is a precarious process of keeping up quality standards. According to IUCN the most common criticism they hear is the concern that the “standards are slipping”.¹⁷⁴ World Heritage sites have received this status because they are unique sites, of universal value and as such rare. Or so it should be. It is therefore vital that the World Heritage community at large, and the World Heritage Committee in particular, ensure the quality of the World Heritage List. If not, it will affect all sites on the World Heritage List, including those in the Netherlands.

4.4 Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism

Reactive Monitoring and Periodic Reporting are tools for monitoring the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. In 2007 a further mechanism was established to support the protection of World Heritage sites in particular circumstances like the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls: the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM).¹⁷⁵ The aim of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism is to ensure proper implementation of Committee decisions and in exceptional cases ‘to allow the sending of one or a series of reports to the World Heritage Committee in the interval between two sessions’. This pro-active role is the main difference with the reactive monitoring process.¹⁷⁶

The five sites of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), the Dresden Elbe Valley in Germany and the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, all on the Danger List, were the first sites to which the RMM was applied. The following year a further four properties received RMM: Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru), Timbuktu (Mali), Bordeaux, Port of the moon (France), and Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan). Those sites, however, were *not* on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Before the 33rd session of the Committee in 2009 the

Director-General of UNESCO applied the RMM to two more sites: the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) and the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia), of which only the latter is on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thus the application of the RMM was interpreted differently: there was the understanding that it would be used for the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger only, and the other view was that it could be used for any site that needed it. Eventually, however, it was seen as an alternative for danger listing. Due to the fact that there was no prior discussion regarding this new mechanism the implication thereof was not fully realised. The document for the World Heritage Committee in 2011 on this topic states that the concept was introduced ‘after a short debate over one World Heritage Committee session, without the level of consultation or consideration of all the operational aspects’.¹⁷⁷

Between the establishment of the RMM in 2007 and 2012, the Committee adopted forty decisions in relation to 14 World Heritage sites of which only five set a clear periodicity for the RMM reports. In five cases the RMM was combined with a request for a state of conservation report. Decision making was still rather inconsistent: six decisions gave an indication regarding the duration of the RMM, in four cases there is no mention of the RMM itself and five properties had the RMM renewed with no timeframe even though it was earlier recorded that for one year. The same document composed by the World Heritage Centre for the 35th session of the Committee (2011) states that ‘the existing mechanisms (reactive monitoring reporting and missions, Danger-listing) can satisfactorily address the issues, and the added-value of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism’ in terms of the improved frequency reporting ‘therefore remains to be demonstrated’.¹⁷⁸

Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism at Virunga National Park (DRC)

One of the sites where the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM) has been applied, is Virunga National Park in the Democratic Republic of Congo. This site was one of the first to be inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 and was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1994, mainly for the adverse impact of refugees, unauthorized presence of armed militia and settlers inside the property, and increased poaching, deforestation, and pressure of fishing villages inside the park.¹⁷⁹ Limited financial resources were also an issue, which was already mentioned in IUCN’s evaluation report (1979) of the nomination of the site.¹⁸⁰ Virunga National Park received a total of US\$ 212,160 in international assistance, and the extra-budgetary funds come to US\$ 120,000 plus a share of the US\$ 1,500,000 earmarked for all five DRC sites (up to 2011). There is great international attention for the plight of Virunga National Park and the four other sites in the DRC that are on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Like France and Japan in Angkor, Belgium is taking a special interest in the five sites of the DRC. When the Committee inscribed the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1994, it recorded the following:

The Committee recognized that a major effort over the next decade will be needed to rehabilitate and strengthen management of Virunga and obtain local support for its conservation. (...) [It] express[ed] its concern over depletion of forest resources in the Park, stressing that utmost care be taken to avoid establishment of refugee camps in or near national parks (...) [and] asked the Centre to inform the Government of Zaire of its willingness to co-operate with IUCN as well as WWF, World Bank, UNDP,

UNHCR and GTZ and provide technical cooperation and training assistance to address threats to the integrity of Virunga.¹⁸¹

In 2007 the World Heritage Committee called upon the Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to convene a meeting with the DRC authorities to discuss progress in addressing the deteriorating state of conservation of their sites.¹⁸² This meeting took place in Kinshasa (DRC) on 14 January 2011, where the DG of UNESCO recalled that ‘despite the combined efforts of the Government and the international community, the degradation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the DRC World Heritage properties had not yet been reversed and noted that the World Heritage Committee expected a strong and clear commitment on the part of the Government to secure the sites and halt the illicit exploitation of their natural resources’.¹⁸³ Germany reaffirmed the commitment of the donor community to continue its technical and financial assistance for the conservation of the sites.¹⁸⁴ The meeting resulted in the Kinshasa Declaration. This Declaration states the commitment of the Government to implement the corrective measures, work towards the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan proposed by ICCN, end illegal exploitation of natural resources and to reinforce the peaceful evacuation of illegal occupants.¹⁸⁵

In 2011 the World Heritage Committee welcomed ‘the significant efforts made by the managing authority (ICCN), with the support of donors and conservation partners to implement the corrective measures despite very difficult conditions, especially the persistent problems related to the lack of security’.¹⁸⁶

5 The Various Funds – How Do They Operate?

Being placed on the World Heritage List brings no financial reward, although it is a common misconception that it does. On the contrary, financial resources, although essential for the conservation of World Heritage sites, are scarce and in many cases insufficient. This was also remarked upon by the participants to the earlier mentioned Dakar meeting in 2011 who noted that ‘the World Heritage system does not have the necessary resources to provide the solution to all conservation challenges experienced by the inscribed properties’.¹⁸⁷ This limited availability of resources restricts the actions that can be undertaken; additional funds are a necessity. This is in keeping with the Article 13.6 of the Convention which stipulates that the Committee shall seek ways of increasing the resources.

Ten years ago, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Convention the *World Heritage Partnerships Initiative* (PACT) was launched. The aim of this initiative is to ‘work more closely with research institutions, the corporate sector, trust funds, foundations and individuals who express a keen interest in developing long term international support and solidarity for the conservation of World Heritage’.¹⁸⁸ After all, conservation of the World Heritage sites is the responsibility of the entire international community and should involve all stakeholders for it to be sustainable and successful. The World Heritage Centre has for example partnerships with Google, *National Geographic*, Nokia and Panasonic.

The *Strategic Action Plan and Vision*, as mentioned in chapter 3, identifies the ‘priority accorded to Preparatory Assistance in comparison to assistance for conservation and management and reinforce training in the field of management and conservation’. Another priority is the ‘estimation and allocation of funding needed for the conservation and collecting ad hoc resources’.¹⁸⁹ These priorities should result in high quality nominations and hopefully less work later on in the process when it comes to conservation issues. This means that the decisions are ‘costed, reporting considers all sources of funding and funding reflects agreed priorities’.¹⁹⁰ Such costing as integral part of the nomination process was already requested in 2007 but so far it has not been (fully) applied. The fact that there are not enough financial resources in the World Heritage Fund to support all World Heritage sites is a given. But what direct and indirect costs are needed to support the upkeep and conservation, is not. For example, if the Committee asks for a monitoring mission to a World Heritage site, the financial implications of this decision can be made explicit, and who is going to pay (the World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage Centre in terms of staff, the Advisory Bodies, the States Party, etcetera). Such transparency was requested in 2011 by the World Heritage Committee when it asked for the World Heritage Centre to ‘develop standard modular costs for core activities for consideration at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee, to enable the Committee to assess the costs and workload implications of decisions for all stakeholders (States Parties, Committee, Secretariat, Advisory Bodies) prior to adoption’.¹⁹¹ Such a comprehensive view of the costs could help in setting the priorities and also targeting potential partners for financial contributions.

There are various sources of funding or other means of contributing towards the working of the Convention. The World Heritage Fund, which is part of the Convention. This is UNESCO’s regular budget which is used to pay World Heritage Centre staff costs and activities carried out by the Centre and UNESCO field offices. Then there are extra-budgetary contributions. These are donations by States Parties often for special projects or programmes. These frequently take the form of bilateral co-operation agreements such as funds-in-trust. Furthermore, there is the financial input by each State Party on managing their own World Heritage sites. Some of this is additional funding which would not be available if the site was not on the World Heritage List.

States Parties can apply for assistance from the World Heritage Fund and the World Heritage Committee can encourage States Parties to do so as this example from a Committee decision in 2011 shows:

Requests the States Parties concerned to fully collaborate, providing technical support and seed funding to implement the required actions, encourages them to seek assistance from the World Heritage Fund, if necessary and calls upon States Parties and the international community to provide technical and financial support to assist the States Parties concerned in the implementation of their pilot projects.¹⁹²

The World Heritage Fund is based on contributions equal to one percent from Member States' contribution to UNESCO and voluntary contributions by other organizations of the United Nations system, States, private organizations and individuals. It totals about US\$ 4 million annually.¹⁹³ This does raise the aspect of sustainability though, as there are now around double the number of World Heritage sites there were 15 years ago and resources have not expanded to the same degree.

The World Heritage Fund assists in the protection World Heritage.¹⁹⁴ It supports the evaluation and monitoring processes of the Convention, including the work of the Advisory Bodies. Furthermore, requests for assistance from States Parties for preparing nominations, and protection and conservation of World Heritage. However, payment into the Fund by States Parties is not always made on time. As it is a prerequisite for participation in elections for the world Heritage Committee, payment are generally made just before then. This can result in a discrepancy between what should be in the Fund in theory and what is there in reality as the financial reports sometimes show. The 2012 World Heritage Committee document on the financial account states that '39 States Parties had not paid their contributions and 11 States Parties only partially as at 31 December 2011'.¹⁹⁵

A State Party can apply for international assistance from the World Heritage Fund when deemed necessary:

The Convention provides International Assistance to States Parties for the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage located in their territories and inscribed, or potentially suitable for inscription, on the World Heritage List. International Assistance should be seen as complementary to national efforts for the conservation and management of World Heritage and Tentative List properties when adequate resources cannot be secured at the national level. And priority is given to International Assistance for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger [...].¹⁹⁶

Even though any State Party may request international assistance, not all States Parties are likely to get it. The World Heritage Committee decides whether or not to approve requests for international assistance and determines an order of priorities for its operations bearing in mind the urgency of the work, the resources available to the States Parties and the extent to which they are able to safeguard such property by their own means.¹⁹⁷ The *Operational Guidelines* (paragraphs 236-238) set out certain aspects for the Committee to take into consideration when deciding about requests. Preference is given to least developed countries, lower middle income countries, small island developing states, and States Parties in post-conflict situations. Other factors are for example whether or not the assistance will function as a catalyst and the capacity building value of the proposed activity.

Furthermore, sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger are given priority concerning international assistance. There is a special budget line for these sites.¹⁹⁸ The more specific information concerning the budget needed the better. International assistance has three categories: (1) preparatory assistance, (2) conservation and management assistance (which includes, training and research assistance, technical co-operation, and promotional and educational assistance), and (3) emergency assistance.¹⁹⁹

	<i>Preparatory assistance</i>	<i>Conservation and Management assistance</i>			<i>Emergency assistance</i>
		<i>Technical co-operation</i>	<i>Training and research assistance</i>	<i>Educational and promotional assistance</i>	
Director World Heritage Centre Chairperson	Up to US\$ 5,000	Up to US\$ 5,000	Up to US\$ 5,000	Up to US\$ 5,000	Up to US\$ 5,000
World Heritage Committee	US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 30,000	US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 30,000	US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 30,000	US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 10,000	US\$ 5,001 to US\$ 75,000
World Heritage Committee	N/A	Over US\$ 30,000	Over US\$ 30,000	N/A	Over US\$ 75,000

Table 2 - Overview international assistance based on the *Operational Guidelines*, paragraph 241

The requests for this kind of assistance vary in success. In general it can be said that coordination with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is important, as is the clarity of the request: clearly state what it is for, what budget is needed and how the assistance is organized. There are also other factors of influence on the success of the application, namely the priority of the topic and funds available at the time of request. Once the assistance has been granted there is no guarantee for success:

So far, an amount of US\$ 5,274,708 (360 requests) has been provided to States Parties from the World Heritage Fund as 'Preparatory Assistance' to help them inter alia to prepare nominations. Of this, an amount of US\$ 3,223,699 (61%) was dedicated specifically to the preparation of nomination files (186 requests). Only 62 requests (for a total amount of US\$ 976,142) led to an inscription or an extension of an existing property approved by the World Heritage Committee, i.e. only 18.5% of the total preparatory assistance had a positive result! Even if only the 186 requests for preparation of nominations are considered, the success percentage goes up marginally to 30%.²⁰⁰

This emphasises the need to re-evaluate the international assistance system and the importance of the upstream process. Working with all relevant parties from the start should contribute towards high quality nominations.

5.1 Funds-in-Trust

Some countries have a bilateral financial agreement with UNESCO, and the World Heritage Centre in particular. This mostly is organized as a Funds-in-Trust: voluntary financial contributions given by countries to support specific goals and objectives. In relation to the World Heritage Convention there is for example a France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement, or Japanese, Spanish and Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, each one with a different focus.²⁰¹ The France-UNESCO Co-operation Agreement is a 'technical and financial treaty [which] allows UNESCO to benefit from the technical support of experts from the French government, French institutions, and local authorities and associations'.²⁰² It focuses on architectural, urban and

landscape heritage with Africa and French territorial authorities. It has a mixed Co-ordinating Committee which meets once a year to define the orientations and establish a programme of actions.²⁰³ The Japanese Trust Fund focuses on the preservation of cultural heritage by means of 'restoration and preservation work and the necessary preliminary or general studies and surveys (including limited archaeological excavation work) for this purpose'.²⁰⁴ The Spanish Funds-in-Trust supports the implementation of the Global Strategy of the Convention. The Fund is also used to reinforce the capacity of the World Heritage Centre.²⁰⁵ There is special emphasis on the Latin American and Caribbean region. This demonstrates that Funds have different objectives and ways of operating.

5.1.1 Netherlands Funds-in-Trust (NFiT)

The Netherlands Funds-in-Trust (NFiT) was established in 2001 for a period of four years by the Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science with the aim of reinforcing the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.²⁰⁶ Following the adoption of the Global Strategy by the World Heritage Committee, the Dutch Minister of Culture wanted to take on a pro-active attitude towards the obligation of the Netherlands as a State Party to the World Heritage Convention and its aim of international co-operation. The Netherlands supported the Global Strategy's intention to fight the geographical imbalance of the World Heritage List.²⁰⁷ The Netherlands Funds-in-Trust established for the period 2001-2004 with € 1.8 million, and it has since been extended every four years.²⁰⁸ Initially it was guided by four main categories: implementation of the Global Strategy; Education and World Heritage in Young Hands; technical assistance; and periodic reporting of the World Heritage sites. The Global Strategy and the so-called 5C's (credibility, conservation, communication, capacity building and community) were leading in designating financial assistance.²⁰⁹ The Funds-in-Trust provided the opportunity to influence the allocation of the money. The World Heritage Centre is responsible for its administration, which was one of the reasons to have the NFiT in Paris and not at the own ministry. Another reason was that providing financial support via UNESCO could avoid potential political sensitivity concerning the financial assistance.²¹⁰ The NFiT is rather special in the sense that there are no restrictions to allocating funds to particular regions of the world or to specific experts for missions or implementation of projects.²¹¹

It should be noted here that the NFiT is not very visible or as widely known as it could be. The Fund contributes worldwide to the implementation of the Convention and it would be good to inform the public, both professional and persons interested, about the work that is being done with Dutch financial support. It might also contribute to awareness raising on the Convention and the management of heritage worldwide. The 2012 book about ten years of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust *From Astronomy to Zanzibar. 10 Years of Dutch support to World Heritage* can contribute to this. Strategies could be implemented to make optimal use of for instance the media coverage which is generated in the country of assistance, by placing it on the website of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust. If, as is now the case, the latest news on the NFiT website dates from long ago, this gives the false impression that nothing has happened. Transparency with respect to the value and the results of the NFiT could contribute to its sustainability and political support for another extension of the Fund after 2016. The aim is to increase the visibility of the NFiT, not to create more work, hence the emphasis on using information what is already out there. After all, communication is one of the guiding 5 C's of the Convention.

It is suggested that the NFiT also focuses on the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. As explained in chapter 4, this list is an important tool to prevent the loss of OUV for specific sites, and thus to enhance the credibility of the World Heritage List as a whole. Contributing to desired states of conservation for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger List implies that goals are clear set, and approaches approved. Financial support from the NFiT will increase its visibility while assisting with the earlier mentioned goal of reducing the number of

sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, or at least the time that they are on this list. Assistance from the NFiT could be used for management effectiveness assessments for the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Also, the involvement of the NFiT could attract other sponsors for the sites.

Currently the NFiT works with relative small amounts which serve as ‘seed money’. This is fully in line with the philosophy of UNESCO to have countries provide part of the needed budget themselves and it is even written in the Convention ([Article 25](#)) that ‘as a general rule, only part of the cost of work necessary shall be borne by the international community. The contribution of the State Party benefiting from international assistance shall constitute a substantial share of the resources devoted to each programme or project, unless its resources do not permit this’. The NFiT, could consider spending part of the financial allocation of the NFiT to larger contributions, for example projects in relation to sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a way to shorten the period those sites are actually on that list.

5.2 Other Funds and forms of financial assistance

There are other recent developments to support the working of the Convention, like the UNESCO Category II Centres (C2C). These Centres, an initiative of the last decade, are organizations which operate under the auspices of UNESCO and support the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. The C2C are funded by the host country and vary in scope, from a regional focus to a thematic approach.²¹² The downside of C2C is that there is no monitoring or evaluation system, so the quality is not a given. This is however in the process of changing. The positive aspect of the C2C is that they contribute towards the capacity building in relation to World Heritage in their region and thereby contributing towards balancing out the World Heritage List. The following six C2C are World Heritage related:

- Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF / Oslo, Norway);
- World Heritage Institute of Training and Research-Asia and Pacific (WHITR-AP / Beijing, Shanghai and Suzhou, China);
- Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH / Bahrain);
- Regional Heritage Management Training Centre in Brazil (Rio de Janeiro);
- African World Heritage Fund (AWHF / Johannesburg, South Africa);
- Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas, Mexico.

African World Heritage Fund

The African World Heritage Fund was established in 2006 to ‘support the effective conservation and protection of natural and cultural heritage of outstanding universal value in Africa’.²¹³ The Netherlands have contributed towards the establishment of this Fund by giving a financial contribution for the feasibility study and the fund itself. The first results of the AWHF are already noticeable: they played an important role in the second cycle of Period Reporting which finished in 2011 and they have provided a series of training programmes, for example on the preparation of World Heritage Nominations.²¹⁴ The Fund does indeed function as a stimulus for heritage capacity building in the region and also as a link between the World Heritage Centre in Paris and the sites in Africa.

In order to ensure conservation of the World Heritage sites, involvement of all stakeholders is necessary, both government and non-governmental organization. This can be parties that are directly linked to a World Heritage site or the Convention, like States Parties, but it can also be commercial partners, like Shell. The oil company announced on 27 august 2003 that it will not 'explore, or develop, oil and gas resources within any of natural World Heritage sites'. The statement said that:

The nature of our operations as an energy company means that we will have an impact on the environment. We know that we have a responsibility to ensure that impact is minimised and that the long term legacy of our projects is a good one. ²¹⁵

Earlier the International Council on Mining and Metals already expressed its intention not to explore or mine in World Heritage sites.²¹⁶ Another example is the Shell Foundation, which worked with the World Heritage Centre and Earthwatch to develop a Business Planning Skills Project: *Business Planning for Natural World Heritage Sites – A Toolkit*. With this initiative up to 15 natural World Heritage sites will receive training from Shell executives on business planning, followed by a one year monitoring and support effort.²¹⁷

On the first of July 2011 the World Bank and UNESCO signed a Memory of Understanding (MoU) concerning technical collaboration between the two organizations, especially concerning sustainable development:

The MoU is part of UNESCO's efforts to promote the culture and development agenda, and its efforts to support countries in achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). For the World Bank, signing the MoU communicates a clear message that it attaches increasing importance to cultural values in its operations and recognizes the positive role of culture in development.²¹⁸

The MoU focuses on historic cities preservation and rehabilitation, the promotion of cultural diversity, the conservation of natural heritage sites and the economics of culture. Furthermore, the World Bank is also involved with sustainable tourism as a means of economic growth:

Whether through an investment-lending project, a grant or technical assistance, the focus of the Bank's assistance has been to ensure that investments in cultural heritage leverage further growth in other sectors, primarily sustainable tourism. Perceived as assets for economic development, these investments contributed to social cohesion, community development, and the protection of a cultural identity that defines societies' past, present, and future.²¹⁹

The European Union (EU) is another player in this field. It for example funded a project in Salonga National Park (DRC) for the surveillance activities, patrol rations and a strategy to minimize and mitigate the impact of villages in the Park, and in Virunga National Park it supports a project to institutional reform of the managing authority (ICCN).²²⁰ In Europe the EU contributed towards the conservation of the Church of the Annunciation of the Moldovita Monastery (Romania). In the historic centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) they financed a project to improve the infrastructure in the inhabited area within the fortress walls of the Kala quarter.²²¹

There is however need for clearer communication between all parties in order to prevent projects overlapping or even conflicting with one another:

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the Eco-Fauna project of the European Union is currently being launched in the vicinity of Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) and continues to bolster the VHZ [Village Hunting Zones]. However, they believe that few results can be expected for the preservation of the property, as the project's strategy is focused primarily on the VHZ rather than on the conservation of the property itself. In addition, the budget seems inadequate in view of the area of intervention to cover (4 million Euros for an area of 100,000 km²).²²²

Even though World Heritage status is no guarantee for additional funding as stated in chapter 3, it can attract outside investment. Pricewaterhouse and Coopers (2007) found that World Heritage sites can increase the levels of investment and that most of the extra funding is either local or regional. This underlines the idea that World Heritage can certainly play a role in sustainable eco-social development in their region. In Edinburgh, for example, the World Heritage status functioned as a catalyst for attracting funding and mobilising local residents and enterprises with the result that 'in 2009-2010 for every £1 of funding given to Edinburgh World Heritage site from the City of Edinburgh Council, Edinburgh World Heritage site levered in a further £6 and for every £1 of funding from Historic Scotland, they levered in an additional £4'.²²³

6 Recommendations and Observations

6.1 The Netherlands and the World Heritage Convention: General observations

The World Heritage Convention is dynamic and not just a static set of rules, regulations and World Heritage properties; ideas, conceptions, practices, material structures and societal contexts change. The 40th anniversary of the Convention is both an occasion for celebration as well as a moment for deeper reflection on its future. For the Netherlands it is important to do so as a State Party and as a much appreciated contributor to the global working of the Convention. The five major strategic goals for a sustainable future of the Convention provide a valuable frame for policy development focusing on: the *Outstanding Universal Value* (OUV) of each site; the quality of their management and state of conservation; the credibility of the World Heritage List in its totality; political transparency and professional expertise in decision-making processes; and an efficient organization of the World Heritage policies.

In order to be eligible for World Heritage status, a property has to be of OUV, thus truly special worldwide. The OUV is the cornerstone of each World Heritage site. It has become evident that for the credibility of the World Heritage List and the Convention at large international commitment to work towards a more balanced List is needed and that sometimes difficult decisions have to be taken like deleting sites from the List. The delisting of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) and the Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) functioned as a warning for other sites and it certainly has made States Parties more aware of the impact of an irreversible loss of OUV. The credibility of the List and the Convention is important to the Netherlands both in the context of the national sites and of the more general debate at the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention (GA) and the Committee meetings.

There is a varying degree of active involvement of States Parties to the Convention. Some take an active role either by serving on the World Heritage Committee or actively contributing to expert meetings and other discussions in relation to the Convention, whilst others take a less active approach. It is up to the State Party to decide how actively it will be involved with the Convention but the more active the engagement, the more potential influence on the future of the Convention and thus the future of their World Heritage sites it has. The Netherlands has since joining the Convention in 1992 been an active State Party, which is perhaps best illustrated by its time on the World Heritage Committee (2003-2007) and the establishment of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust.

The rationale to remain an active State Party to the World Heritage Convention can be summarized as follows:

- 1 The Netherlands has nine World Heritage sites and ten sites on the Tentative List
Maintaining the OUV of these existing and potential World Heritage sites, embedded in the broader heritage obligations mentioned in the Convention, already implies a further commitment and responsibility. The required Periodic Reporting offers a good opportunity to assess current national World Heritage policies, also in an international context.

World Heritage is receiving more and more awareness in the Netherlands. Sites attract an increasing attention, both by professionals and non-professionals. The fact that World Heritage is one of the priorities of the 2012 policy document 'Character in Focus. Vision for Heritage and Spatial Planning' underlines this, as well as the increasing attention in the media to this topic.

- 2 The quality and credibility of the World Heritage List is relevant to all sites, including the Dutch ones. If the List devaluates, this will also affect the status of the Dutch sites

The quality of the World Heritage List is relevant to all sites, including the Dutch ones. If the List devaluates or the credibility is under threat, this has an impact on the status of the Dutch sites. The Netherlands can contribute to strategic and effective procedures for the sustainable management and conservation of all World Heritage sites, via for example active involvement in the setting up and implementation of the World Heritage Convention *Strategic Action Plan* or general heritage policy debates.

- 3 Obtaining input and expertise from the international community – sharing experiences and expertise

By actively participating in the Convention, national issues can be brought to the attention of the international experts, like for example new developments, resulting in an exchange of ideas and possible solutions can be taken home. Being involved with the World Heritage Convention implies that the Netherlands does not have to work out such challenges by itself, but can share its views and experiences with other States Parties.

The fact that World Heritage status stimulates discussions on all levels about conservation issues can be regarded as a positive development because it raises awareness and increases the knowledge about this topic. These discussions could be used as a platform for trying to find solutions for challenges sites face, like tourism, or simply for exchanging ideas.

Apart from these considerations, it is relevant to ask whether the Netherlands can have an impact on the workings of the Convention without being a Committee Member. Input certainly can be given at various moments, namely:

- a Biannually at the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention;
- b By either attending, giving input via paper, other persons or by organising expert meetings oneself;
- c In the open-ended working groups during the Committee sessions (once a year) and subsequent follow-up meetings;
- d Via like-minded Committee Members during the Committee session.

It is important to note that the GA has become more important at the World Heritage Convention policy level, with more items being placed on its agenda. And unlike the Committee meetings, all States Parties can actively contribute to the discussion and subsequent decisions. Though pending on the choice of the chairpersons, observers to the Committee meeting, including non-Committee States Parties, get the floor during a discussion. Thus, there might be a possibility for the Netherlands to give direct input at Committee sessions discussions, to be decided, however, by the chair.

Effective input requires a selection on what topics to focus on in relation to the many topics within the Convention, topics the Netherlands feel strongly about or have an interest in. Recommended are the following topics:

- a Standards of conservation, including particularly what is / is not permitted within the location setting of World Heritage sites;
- b Sustainable tourism;
- c Training and capacity building for site management and conservation.

Conservation is the crux of the Convention; the passing on of this exceptional heritage to future generations. It is therefore advisable to remain involved in this aspect of the Convention. Furthermore, tourism is an important economic factor in the Netherlands and relevant for all

Dutch World Heritage sites. The Dutch sites are looking into ways of dealing with tourism. UNESCO's Sustainable Tourism Strategy could be a useful tool not only on the international level, but certainly also on a national level. Another process the Netherlands could consider getting actively involved in is the capacity building strategy. Reflection on their own needs in this respect and providing active input for the development of the strategy in the Europe and North American region will contribute towards ensuring the utmost relevance and usefulness of this strategy not only for the Convention but also for the Netherlands.

6.2 Challenges for a sustainable World Heritage Convention

This report has discussed various developments in relation to the sustainable future of the World Heritage Convention. The most relevant will be summarized below.

There is a focus on the nomination process; this should not diminish the attention for the conservation of existing properties. [Article 5](#) of the Convention contains the general responsibilities for each State Party regarding the conservation of natural and cultural heritage in general, not just World Heritage. By highlighting the positive aspects of the World Heritage Convention, like good practices, World Heritage sites can also serve as an example and source of inspiration for the management of heritage sites in general.

The upstream process is working towards an earlier interaction between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party. This process could also be beneficial for the Netherlands. By working with all relevant parties on a nomination from the earliest moment possible should contribute towards high quality nominations with hopefully fewer conservation challenges in the future.

Setting priorities for the future of the Convention is essential. The *Strategic Action Plan* aims to do so. It identifies several measures in relation to the List of World Heritage in Danger as the highest priority. A site cannot be on the List of World Heritage in Danger forever, nor should it remain on the World Heritage List when it has irreversibly lost all its OUV.

In order to ensure that sites get off the List of World Heritage in Danger as soon as possible, it is imperative to develop corrective measures, a timeframe and a desired state of conservation for removal. Costing of these measures is important, for several reasons. It gives the State Party a clear indication about which measures are needed within which timeframe to get the site from the list. It is therefore a positive development that the World Heritage Committee has requested the World Heritage Centre to include a costed programme when inscribing a new World Heritage site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This will provide potential financiers with a clear overview of the measures and the cost, and assist in selecting in what they want to invest. It also emphasises the temporary nature of being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The List of World Heritage in Danger has a negative image and does not always function as intended, namely as a conservation tool. States Parties regard placement of a site on this list too often as a punishment rather than as a means of mobilising international assistance. Changing this perception globally is crucial for the list to function as an instrument of support. Another aspect is that although some States Parties explicitly solicit placement on the List of World Heritage in Danger, for the priority status in relation to international assistance and to attract international attention, this does not always materialise.

There is an increasing politicisation of some discussions at the Committee. The politicisation is particularly noticeable during the debate on nominations and state of conservation reports. Another kind of politicisation is the perceived conflict of interest of States Parties in the Committee that present their own new nominations to the World Heritage List.

Some key concepts concerning the Convention need clear definition to prevent different interpretations or expectations. An example is the application of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism (RMM) with its initial ambiguity about what it does, for which sites and when. Clarification of paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* regarding major restorations and new constructions is desirable; as is the establishment of clear criteria regarding the application of impact assessments. It is currently not always clear when this paragraph applies as it is not always clear when something will have a significant impact or not, and according to whom.

The World Heritage system's financial resources are under pressure, with the ever increasing number of World Heritage sites but without equally growing resources. Extra budgetary funding is needed for the proper working of the Convention, including its secretariat. There is no financial reward for being placed on the World Heritage List. On the contrary, more finance is needed to sustain the conservation of the sites. In order to know how much money is precisely needed it is a good initiative to cost all decisions and that the funding reflects the agreed priorities. Furthermore, a comprehensive overview of costs involved in nomination, monitoring and conservation processes, is needed. As such the requested development of standard modular costs for core activities to enable the Committee to assess the costs and workload implications of decisions for all stakeholders (States Parties, Committee, Secretariat, and Advisory Bodies) prior to adoption is a very valid one. Having a comprehensive view of the costs helps in setting the priorities and specifically targeting potential partners for financial contributions, including outside investment.

World Heritage communication strategies need to be strengthened, both at the level of the World Heritage Centre and among all stakeholders. The UNESCO based website of the Convention is a crucial tool for communication. It does however need improvement, in order to facilitate an optimal exchange of expertise, transparency in decision making processes, and communication with the wider public with respect to the World Heritage programme and the individual sites. In order to ensure conservation of the World Heritage sites, communication strategies that involve all stakeholders are necessary so as to ensure awareness and to prevent projects overlapping or even being in conflict with one another.

6.3 Relevant points for the Netherlands in relation to the Convention

With these general challenges as a background, how could the Netherlands contribute towards a sustainable future for the World Heritage Convention?

A pro-active attitude

The Netherlands is generally well informed about what is going on regarding the Convention. It is important to maintain this focus as well as to use the opportunities available for giving an active contribution, as for example, active participation at the GA (also relevant with respect to the election of Committee Members).

The Netherlands can contribute to the strengthening of the focus on conservation; as a priority in the current discussions at the Committee, during the GA and expert meetings. It can actively contribute to the *Strategic Action Plan* by helping to set the priorities, especially with respect to the List of World Heritage in Danger. Concerning the implementation of the Convention it is important to try and have the monitoring mechanisms as compatible as possible to the Dutch system. The Convention does entail certain challenges, like for example with transboundary co-operation. This requires good coordination not only on a national but also international level, with both the individual national regulations and the requirements of the Convention. Thus the more compatible all the systems are, the easier and more effective they will be to work with.

Communication strategies

Ensure clear lines of communication among all Dutch stakeholders, be it the ministries, cultural heritage agency, permanent delegation or the site holders themselves. The permanent delegation of the Netherlands to UNESCO is an important player as they know what goes on at UNESCO and their feedback to the ministries is important so that they remain well informed. They in turn need to have a dialogue with the various stakeholders in the field. And vice versa, the information the stakeholders provide the ministries with can be used as input in discussions in Paris. The active World Heritage community in the Netherlands can be used for bringing the Convention to the attention of the wider audience but also to receive input on relevant issues in relation to World Heritage. For example, the *Stichting Werelderfgoed.nl* can play a part concerning public awareness raising, together with the National Commission for UNESCO and the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency, and it can also highlight the issues relevant for them in relation to the Convention. Thus the better the dialogue between all stakeholders, the more informed everyone is and the more relevant the input of the Netherlands on World Heritage matters on both national and international level.

New nominations

Contributing to the credibility of the World Heritage List also implies an assessment of the national nomination policy. Having a balanced nomination process in line with the Global Strategy implies the nominating of under-represented categories where appropriate and a careful pacing out of the new nominations over time. Another strategy to address geographical imbalances is twinning with preparing new nominations. For example, when the Netherlands is working on a new nomination this could go in co-operation with a similar type of nomination in a country which is under-represented on the World Heritage List, thus an active exchange of information, knowledge and experience. Twinning could also be thought of between existing sites. The upstream processes could be applied where appropriate, like for example when reviewing the Tentative List and the priority of nominations.

Policy development with respect to existing sites

As mentioned before, UNESCO's Strategy for Sustainable Tourism can be an input for the development of the national tourism strategy, especially with respect to raising awareness about the value of the World Heritage sites amongst tourism stakeholders and to ensure that tourism has no adverse impact on the sites.

Furthermore, a pro-active application of EIA / HIA as a conservation tool where appropriate can assist in evaluating conservation issues in relation to Dutch sites on the World Heritage List and Tentative List. Other States Parties, like the United Kingdom, have a lot of experience with this conservation tool which the Netherlands can use when looking into applying this tool itself.

Periodic Reporting

The second cycle of Periodic Reporting of Europe and North America started in the summer of 2012 and looks into (national) heritage policies and the state of conservation of World Heritage sites. On the 31st July 2013 the questionnaire to the Periodic Reporting for Western Europe has to be submitted and the results will be presented during the World Heritage Committee meeting in June / July 2014. The entire report and proposed Action Plan will be ready for the Committee meeting in June / July 2015.

All Dutch World Heritage sites now have a (draft) Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which serves as the basis for the reporting. There are also regional meetings to prepare the Periodic Reporting and these offer a network for discussing ideas and practical solutions to challenges. The initiative to provide a training session for site holders from Belgium, Luxemburg and the Netherlands is a good example of such international cooperation. This network should be stimulated as much as possible during and after the Periodic Reporting cycle by for example

providing opportunities to exchange ideas, be it via field visits or one-day symposia on a heritage topic.

Netherlands Funds-in-Trust

Finally, the proper use of the List of World Heritage in Danger could be encouraged by tying assistance with the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, while also highlighting the intended application and effect of this list. Regardless of such policy choices, an increasing of the visibility of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust is recommended.

Notes

- 1 <http://www.unesco.org/en/statesparties>, Accessed 16 June 2011
- 2 UNESCO, 1972: Article 4
- 3 UNESCO, 1972: Article 5
- 4 IUCN, 2008: 4
- 5 <http://www.unesco.org/news/en/unesco/about-us/who-are-we/history>, consulted on 16 June 2011
- 6 WHC-07/31.COM/19A: recommendation 4.1
- 7 Out of the 962 sites on the World Heritage List, 745 are cultural and 188 natural sites, and 29 sites are mixed.
Not every State Party to the Convention has a site on the List as the 962 properties are located in 157 States Parties. Source: <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>, Accessed 24 July 2012
- 8 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties>, Accessed 16 June 2011
- 9 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list>, Accessed 24 July 2012
- 10 As agreed by the General Assembly in its 13th session in 2001
- 11 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/134>, Accessed 3 February 2012
- 12 WHC-07/31.COM/19A: 46
- 13 UNESCO, 2011a: § 17-18
- 14 UNESCO, 1972: Article 11.2
- 15 UNESCO, 2005: §4
- 16 UNESCO, 2011a: § 62
- 17 UNESCO, 2011a: § 77 – 78
- 18 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/stat#d1>, Accessed 24 July 2012
- 19 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A: § 11
- 20 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy/>, Accessed 16 June 2011
- 21 WHC-11/35.COM/9A and WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A
- 22 WHC-09/17.GA/10
- 23 UNESCO, 2011a: § 201
- 24 The preparatory phase of the European cycle was from 2001 to 2002, and the results of the exercise were presented at the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee in Vilnius, Lithuania, in 2006 (Rössler, M. and C. Menétrey-Monchau, 2007: 14-15).
- 25 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2006–2007, 28 989, nr. 46
- 26 This aspect will not be further discussed in this research.
- 27 UNESCO, 2011a: § 77
- 28 UNESCO, 2011a: § 41-42
- 29 WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.1. First meeting of the group was on 9 January 2012.
- 30 Choirokoitia (Cyprus), Painted Churches in the Troodos Region (Cyprus), Paphos (Cyprus), Castel del Monte (Italy), and Kernarvé Archaeological Site (Lithuania). <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/movable-heritage-and-museums/armed-conflict-and-heritage/enhanced-protection/>, Accessed 12 March 2012
- 31 35 COM 12E: § 11
- 32 A report written during the researchers time at the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO after the Dutch mandate in the World Heritage committee had ended provided input for this chapter, especially in the relation to point 2.2 in this Chapter. Permission to use this report has been granted by the National Commission. The opinions in this chapter are the authors and not those of the National Commission.
- 33 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44. The exact date is 26 August 1992.
- 34 Kamerstuk 27432, nr.31 – 15 mei 2001
- 35 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44. Translation of information from Dutch documents for the report into English by author.
- 36 Outcome during the expert meeting regarding this research at the *Vrije Universiteit*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands on 19 April 2012.
- 37 Commissie Herziening Voorlopige Lijst Werelderfgoed, 2010. The Dutch terminology for the themes are: Nederland waterland, Nederland als ontworpen land en Nederland als burgersamenleving. The ten sites on the Tentative List are: Bonaire Marine Park, Island of Saba, Eise Eisinga Planetarium, Koloniën van Weldadigheid (agricultural pauper colony), Nieuwe Hollandse Waterlinie, Plantations in West Curaçao, Sanatorium Zonnestraat, Teylers, Van Nelle factory and Frontiers of the Roman Empire (extension): <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/nl>, Accessed on 30 May 2012
- 38 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- 39 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2006–2007, 28 989, nr. 46
- 40 Kamerstuk 27432, nr.31 – 15 mei 2001
- 41 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2004–2005, 29 800 VIII, nr. 15
- 42 More on both topics in chapters 2 and 5 respectively.
- 43 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- 44 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2009–2010, 32 123 VIII, nr. 10
- 45 <http://nos.nl/artikel/236430-noordoostpolder-wil-geen-werelderfgoed-worden.html>, Accessed on 30 May 2012
- 46 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 In this part of the chapter certain interesting topics that were discussed during the Committee sessions will be highlighted. Not everything will be discussed. A more detailed description of the experiences of the Netherlands in the World Heritage Committee can be found in the report by the Netherlands National Commission as mentioned under endnote 32.
- 49 WHC-93/CONF.003/6
- 50 The project management group consisted of the head of the Dutch Delegation, the representative of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science as vice-chair and someone was especially hired part-time to function as Secretary. There was further representation of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture

- and Innovation, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Cultural Heritage Agency and the Netherlands National Commission for UNESCO.
- 51 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2006-2007, 28 989, nr. 46
- 52 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A: § 184
- 53 UNESCO, 1972: Article 8(2), § 21 and Resolutions of the 7th (1989), 12th (1999) and 13th (2001) GA. Committee members are elected during the GA so that all States Parties have a vote. And as the GA only convenes every other year, simultaneously with the General Conference of UNESCO, the term in the Committee can only be a quantity of two, hence the four years instead of six, and not for example five.
- 54 http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_13_en.pdf, Accessed 25 August 2011
- 55 UNESCO, 2011a: § 168
- 56 31.COM.10: § 3
- 57 WHC/35.COM/INF.9A: § 164
- 58 The list of priorities is as follows:
- a nominations of properties submitted by States Parties with no properties inscribed on the List
 - b nominations of properties submitted by States Parties having up to 3 properties inscribed on the List
 - c nominations of properties that have been previously excluded due to the annual limit of 45 nominations and the application of these priorities
 - d nominations of properties for natural heritage
 - e nominations of properties for mixed heritage
 - f nominations of transboundary/transnational properties
 - g nominations from States Parties in Africa, the Pacific and the Caribbean
 - h nominations of properties submitted by States Parties that ratified the *World Heritage Convention* over the last 10 years prior to their submission
 - i nominations of properties submitted by States Parties that have not submitted nominations for ten years or more
 - j when applying this priority system, date of receipt of full and complete nominations by the World Heritage Centre shall be used as a secondary factor to determine the priority between those nominations that would not be designated by the previous points (31 COM 10, § 4).
- 59 35 COM 8B.61: § 3
- 60 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/awhf>, Accessed 31 August 2011
- 61 <http://www.awhf.net/documents/AR%202008.pdf>, Accessed 7 May 2012
- 62 UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2008
- 63 This year the Netherlands was also a vice-chair, meaning that the head of the Dutch delegation, Prof. Dr. Rick van der Ploeg, took over the gavel from the chairperson on several occasions.
- 64 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.12
- 65 30 COM 12: § 6
- 66 31 COM 7B.11
- 67 http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/654.pdf, Accessed on 3 April 2012
- 68 31 COM 7.3: § 1
- 69 Schmitt, 2009: 115
- 70 IUCN, 2008: 3
- 71 36 COM 19: 9A.8
- 72 WHC-11/35.COM/12A
- 73 Ibid. Underlining by author.
- 74 WHC-11/35.COM/9B
- 75 UNESCO, 2011b: 19
- 76 Then again, one should not forget that the *Operational Guidelines* evolved considerably over the years and continue to do so. Hence the present nominations have to comply with stricter demands than those of the earlier days.
- 77 Young, 2007: 28
- 78 IUCN, http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/about_world_heritage/future_challenges/, Accessed 3 April 2012
- 79 35 COM 12B: § 10
- 80 35 COM 12B: § 10
- 81 WHC-10/34.COM/7C: 2
- 82 ICOMOS, 2009: 3
- 83 IUCN, http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/about_world_heritage/future_challenges/, Accessed 3 April 2012
- 84 35 COM 12B: § 9
- 85 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A
- 86 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A
- 87 Ibid.: § 182
- 88 35 COM 20: 12B.14
- 89 35 COM 20: 12B.15
- 90 35 COM 12C
- 91 Commissie Herziening Voorlopige Lijst, 2010: 17
- 92 Rao, 2010:7. Please note that this article was written in a private capacity and not as the Director of the World Heritage Centre.
- 93 WHC-11/35.COM/9A: 5
- 94 Ibid.
- 95 WHC-11/35.COM/9A: 7
- 96 Report of the World Heritage Global Strategy Natural and Cultural Heritage Expert Meeting, 25 to 29 March 1998, Theatre Institute, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- 97 WHC-09/33.COM/7B
- 98 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/463>, Accessed 28 February 2012
- 99 27 COM 7B.47, 28 COM 15B.59 and 29 COM 7B.53
- 100 30 COM 7B.65 and 33 COM 7B.74
- 101 35 COM 12B
- 102 Rao, 2010:4
- 103 Ibid.
- 104 IUCN, 2011
- 105 WHC-11/35.COM/7C
- 106 WHC-10/34.COM/7B
- 107 WHC-10/34.COM/7B.77
- 108 WHC-2000/CONF.204/21
- 109 31 COM 7A.26
- 110 33 COM 7A.25
- 111 WHC-10/34.COM/7C: 13
- 112 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C
- 113 WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add

- 114 Ibid.
- 115 Ibid.
- 116 WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add
- 117 Young, 2007: 10
- 118 Outcome during the expert meeting regarding this research at the *Vrije Universiteit*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands on 19 April 2012.
- 119 Young, 2007: 28
- 120 Tsui, 2010: 8
- 121 IUCN, 2008: 2
- 122 Erlanger, 2012
- 123 Tsui, 2010: 27
- 124 Modiano, 2008
- 125 Tsui, 2010: 21
- 126 WHC-10/34.COM/7A.4
- 127 United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO, 2010
- 128 34 COM 5F2
- 129 UNESCO, 2012b: 4
- 130 UNESCO, 2012b: 10-12
- 131 World Bank, 2011
- 132 Tsui, 2010: 32
- 133 33 COM 8B.4: § 5
- 134 WHC-11/35.COM/12B
- 135 WHC-11/35.COM/9B
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 UNESCO, 2012a
- 139 UNESCO, 2011a: § 169-170
- 140 whc.unesco.org, Accessed 22 February 2008
- 141 UNESCO, 2011a: § 179-180
- 142 UNESCO, 2011b
- 143 08/02/2010 – <http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/20775>, Accessed 25 October 2010
- 144 <http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/20775>, Accessed 25 October 2010
- 145 Schmitt, 2009: 118
- 146 <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn19243-galapagos-off-the-danger-list-still-in-danger.html>, page consulted on 25Oct2010. Bold added by author.
- 147 Ibid.
- 148 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jul/29/galapagos-withdrawn-heritage-danger-list>, Accessed 25 October 2010
- 149 *The Economist*, 2010
- 150 Cameron, 2009
- 151 WHC-02/CONF.202/8: § 24
- 152 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.32
- 153 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.32
- 154 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.32
- 155 UNESCO, 2011a: § 183
- 156 UNESCO, 2011b: 23
- 157 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.19: 28
- 158 WHC-92/CONF.002/12
- 159 Ibid.
- 160 IUCN, 2011
- 161 ICC-Angkor, 2010: 30
- 162 Those countries are Australia, China, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Poland, Singapore, Switzerland and USA. State of Conservation of the World Heritage Properties in the Asia-Pacific Region / South-East Asia / Cambodia / Angkor: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/APA/cycle01/section2/668-summary.pdf>, Accessed 3 January 2012
- 163 28 COM 15B.70
- 164 UNESCO, 2011a: § 192
- 165 WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A
- 166 30 COM 7B.77
- 167 Ibid.
- 168 WHC-09/33.COM/7A.26
- 169 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dresden_Elbe_Valley, Accessed 8 May 2012
- 170 COM 7A.26: § 6 and 8
- 171 33 COM 7A.26: § 10
- 172 <http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/gesellschaft/o,1518,631956,00.html>, Accessed 8 May 2012
- 173 Ibid.
- 174 IUCN, 2008: 2
- 175 WHC-09/33.COM/7.2: § 2
- 176 31 COM 5.2 and 34 COM 7.2: § 1
- 177 WHC-09/33.COM/7.2: § 2
- 178 WHC-11/35.COM/7.2
- 179 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add.4
- 180 http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/o63.pdf, Accessed 28 September 2010
- 181 18 COM IX – SOC: Virunga National Park. According to document WHC-11/35.COM/7A.4 there were six factors were affecting the property: armed conflict, insecurity and political instability; poaching by armed military groups; encroachment; extension of illegal fishing areas; attribution of a petroleum exploration permit inside the property; and deforestation and cattle grazing.
- 182 31 COM 7A.32
- 183 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.35
- 184 Ibid
- 185 Déclaration de Kinshasa sur les Sites du patrimoine mondial de la République Démocratique du Congo. 14 Janvier 2011. <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/news/documents/news-702-1.pdf>, page consulted 3 February 2012
- 186 35 COM 7A.4
- 187 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C
- 188 Bandarin, 2002: 13
- 189 UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2012a: points 16 and 21
- 190 31 COM 18B
- 191 35 COM 12B
- 192 35 COM 12C
- 193 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/world-heritage-fund>, page consulted 3 April 2012 and UNESCO, and 1972: Article 15.3
- 194 UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2009
- 195 WHC-12/36.COM/15.REV: § 7
- 196 UNESCO, 2011a: § 233 and 236
- 197 UNESCO, 1972: Articles 13.1 and 13.4
- 198 UNESCO, 2011a: § 236 and UNESCO, 1972: Article 13(1)
- 199 UNESCO, 2011a: § 241
- 200 Rao, 2010: 6
- 201 These are just a few States Parties that contribute towards the workings of the World

- Heritage Convention via a Funds-in-Trust arrangement. There are other forms of contributing, like for example an annual contribution or funding of specific projects.
- 202 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/cfu>, Accessed 28 April 2012
- 203 Ardesi, 2009: 9-10
- 204 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/partners/277/>, Accessed 28 April 2012
- 205 <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/organizations/documents/organization-279-2.pdf>, Accessed 29 April 2012
- 206 <http://whc.unesco.org/en/nfit>, Accessed 9 April 2012
- 207 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- 208 Oers, R. Van and S. Haraguchi, 2012: 7
- 209 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- 210 Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 56
- 211 Ibid.
- 212 WHC-11/35.COM/9B
- 213 <http://www.awhf.net>, Accessed 9 April 2012
- 214 WHC-11/35.COM/6
- 215 http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=14175&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html, Accessed 29 April 2012
- 216 There is the possibility of a lobby against World Heritage status in order to be able to mine the area, but this information has not been found during this research.
- 217 UNESCO, 2011b: 43
- 218 <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/COUNTRIES/MENAEXT/o,,contentMDK:22954393~menuPK:2246554~pagePK:2865106~piPK:2865128~theSitePK:256299,00.html>, Accessed 29 April 2012
- 219 The World Bank, *Diversifying investments to stimulate economic growth: promoting cultural heritage and sustainable tourism*.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCHD/Resources/430063-1250192845352/MultidonorTF-portfolioreview7-9-09.pdf>, Accessed 26 May 2011
- 220 WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add
- 221 WHC-11/35.COM/7B
- 222 WHC-11/35.COM/7A
- 223 United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO, 2010

References

- Aa, van der, B.J.M. (2005), *Preserving the heritage of humanity? Obtaining world heritage status and the impacts of listing*. Proefschrift Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Ali, Saleem H. (ed.). (2007). *Peace parks. Conservation and conflict resolution*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Ardesi, A., I. Longuet, E. Robert and M.N. Tournoux. (2009). *10 years of the France-UNESCO Convention for Heritage. Putting French expertise to work for the World's Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Badman, T. and G. Debonnet. (2010). 'List of World Heritage in Danger', *World Heritage*, No. 56, pp.64–65. Paris: UNESCO.
- Bandarin, F. (2002). 'World Heritage Partners for Conservation', in UNESCO World Heritage Centre and Regional Bureau for Science in Europe. *World Heritage 2002. Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility. Report International Congress*. Paris: UNESCO, pp. 12-13.
- Bevan, R. (2006). *The destruction of memory. Architecture at war*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Cameron, Ch. (2009). Context of the World Heritage Convention: Key Decisions and Emerging Concepts. Keynote speech delivered at the workshop on 'Reflections on the Future of the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO 25-27 February 2009.
- Commissie Herziening Voorlopige Lijst. (2010). *Uitzonderlijk en universeel. Voorlopige Lijst Unesco Werelderfgoed Koninkrijk der Nederlanden 2010*. Werkendam: Avant GPC.
- De Merode, E., R. Smeets and C. Westrik (eds.). (2003). *Linking Universal and Local Values; Managing a Sustainable Future for World Heritage / L'union des valeurs universelles et locales: La gestion d'un avenir durable pour le patrimoine mondial*, World Heritage Papers 13. Paris: UNESCO.
- Francioni, F. (ed.). (2008). *The 1972 World Heritage Convention: a commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ICOMOS. (2010). *Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties*. Paris: ICOMOS.
- International co-ordinating committee for the safeguarding and development of the historic site of Angkor (ICC-Angkor). (2010). *ICC-Angkor, 15 years of international conservation and sustainable development*. Cambodia: UNESCO Office Phnom Penh.
- International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). (2009). *Submission by ICOMOS. Reflection Workshop on the Future of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: ICOMOS.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2008). *The Future of the World Heritage Convention. Challenges for the next twenty years. An IUCN Perspective*. Gland: IUCN.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2009). *World Heritage in Danger. A compendium of key decisions on the conservation of natural World Heritage properties via the List of World Heritage in Danger*. Gland: IUCN.
- Labadi, S. & Long, C. (eds.). (2010). *Cultural Heritage and Globalisation*. London: Routledge.
- Logan, W. et al. (ed.). (2009). *Cultural Diversity, Heritage and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2011). *Character in focus. Vision for heritage and spatial planning*. Den Haag: Ministry of Education, Culture and Science.
- Nieć, H. (ed.). (1998). *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Oers, R. Van and S. Haraguchi (eds.). (2004). *Activity Report for the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust at the World Heritage Centre, 2001-2004*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Oers, R. Van and S. Haraguchi (eds.). (2012). *From Astronomy to Zanzibar. 10 Years of Dutch support to World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Rao, K. (2010). 'A new paradigm for the identification, nomination and inscription of properties on the World Heritage List', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, Vol. 16, No. 3, pp. 1-14.
- Rössler, M. and C. Menétrey-Monchau (eds.). (2007). *Periodic Report and Action Plan. Europe 2005-2006*. World Heritage Reports 20. Paris: UNESCO.
- Ryan, S. (2000). *The United Nations and International Politics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Schmitt, Th.M. (2009). 'Global Cultural Governance. Decision-making concerning World Heritage between politics and science'. *Erdkunde*. Vol.63, No. 2, pp.103-121.
- Tsui, B. (ed.) (2010). *Saving our vanishing heritage. Safeguarding endangered cultural heritage sites in the developing world*. Palo Alto: Global Heritage Fund.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1954). *Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1970). *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1972). *Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2002). *World Heritage 2002. Shared Legacy, Common Responsibility. Report*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2003). *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2003). *Declaration Concerning the intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.

- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2004). *Promouvoir et préserver le patrimoine congolais. Lier diversité biologique et culturelle / Promoting and Preserving Congolese Heritage. Linking biological and cultural diversity, Actes de la conférence et des ateliers / proceedings of the conference and workshops*, 13-17 septembre 2004. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2005). *Conserving Cultural and Biological Diversity: The Role of Sacred Natural Sites and Cultural Landscapes*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2005)/(2008)/(2011a). *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*. Paris: UNESCO.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2011b). *Managing Natural World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. (2011). *Rules of Procedure*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. (2011). *Rules of Procedure*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2008). *Policy document on the impacts of climate change on World Heritage properties*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre and Shell Foundation. (2008). *Business Planning for Natural World Heritage Sites. A Toolkit*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2009). *Background Document. Workshop to reflect on the Future of the World Heritage Convention*, 25-27 February 2009. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. (2010) *Managing Disaster Risks for World Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM. (2010) *Preparing World Heritage Nominations*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2012a). *Document for the open-ended working group Global Strategy and PACT [no official title known yet]*, 15-16 May 2012. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre. (2012b). *World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme. Draft for consultation, February 2012*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Winter, T. (2007) *Post-conflict Heritage, Postcolonial Tourism; culture, politics and development at Angkor*. London: Routledge.
- Young, Ch. (14 May 2007). *Managing change and World Heritage in the historic urban environment. The UK response to the UNESCO Missions to Liverpool and London. Briefing Document. Technical Seminar, UNESCO Paris*. London: English Heritage.
- Dutch Parliamentary Documents**
- Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 44
- Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2001–2002, 27 432, nr. 56
- Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2004–2005, 29 800 VIII, nr. 15
- Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2006–2007, 28 989, nr. 46
- Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2009–2010, 32 123 VIII, nr. 10
- Kamerstuk 27432, nr.31 – 15 mei 2001
- Webpages**
- African World Heritage Fund. (2009). *Annual Report 2008*. [online] [Accessed 5 May 2012] Available from: <http://www.awhf.net/documents/AR%202008.pdf>
- Déclaration de Kinshasa sur les Sites du patrimoine mondial de la République Démocratique du Congo. (14 Janvier 2011). [online] [Accessed 3 February 2012] Available from: <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/news/documents/news-702-1.pdf>
- Der Spiegel*, (25 June 2009). 'UNESCO-Entscheidung. Dresdner Elbtal verliert Weltkulturerbe-Status'. [online] [Accessed 8 May 2012] Available from: <http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/gesellschaft/o,1518,631956,00.html>
- English Heritage. (2011). *Seeing the history in the view. A method for assessing heritage significance within views*. [online] [Accessed 17 June 2012] Available from: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/content/publications/publicationsNew/guidelines-standards/seeing-history-view/seeing-history-in-view.pdf>
- English Heritage. (2011). *The Settings of Heritage Assets. English Heritage Guidance*. [online] [Accessed 17 June 2012] Available from: <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/advice-by-topic/setting-and-views/>
- Erlanger, S. (6 January 2012). *What does UNESCO Recognition mean, exactly?* The New York Times. [online] [Accessed 12 January 2012] Available from: <http://travel.nytimes.com/2012/01/08/travel/whats-up-with-all-the-unesco-sites.html>
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). (2011). *World Conservation Debate, Mid-life crisis or life just beginning? The World Heritage Convention approaches 40*. [online] [Accessed 6 August 2011] Available from: http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/publications_doc/world_conservation_debate/?7576
- International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). *Future challenges for natural World Heritage*. [online] [Accessed 3 April 2012] Available from: http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/wcpa_worldheritage/about_world_heritage/future_challenges/

- Marshall, M. (30 July 2010). *Galapagos: off the danger list, still in danger*. New Scientist [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010] Available from: <http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn19243-galapagos-off-the-danger-list-still-in-danger.html>
- Mayor of London. (July 2011). *The London Plan. Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London*. [online] [Accessed 17 June 2012] Available from: <http://www.london.gov.uk/publication/world-heritage-sites-spg>
- Ministerie van VenW, ministerie van LNV en ministerie van VROM. (2010). *Deltaprogramma 2011. Werken aan de Delta. Investeren in een veilig en aantrekkelijk Nederland, nu en morgen*. [online] [Accessed 31 January 2012] Available from: www.deltacommissaris.nl en www.rijksoverheid.nl/deltaprogramma
- Modiano, D. (26 October 2008). *The first World Heritage Site in danger by mass tourism*. [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010] Available from: <http://www.tourism-master.nl/2008/10/26/the-first-world-heritage-site-in-danger-by-mass-tourism/>
- Nederlandse Omroep Stichting (28 april 2011). 'Noordoostpolder wil geen werelderfgoed worden'. [online] [Accessed 30 May 2012] Available from: <http://nos.nl/artikel/236430-noordoostpolder-wil-geen-werelderfgoed-worden.html>,
- PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2007). *The Costs and Benefits of UK World Heritage Site Status: A literature review for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport*. [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010] Available from: http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/PwC_literaturereview.pdf
- Rebanks Consulting Ltd and Trends Business Research Ltd. (2009?). *World Heritage Status. Is there opportunity for economic gain? Research and analysis of the socio-economic impact potential of UNESCO World Heritage Site Status*. Kendal: Lake District World Heritage Project. Available from: <http://www.lakeswhs.co.uk/documents/WHSTheEconomicGainFinalReport.pdf>
- Rijkdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed. (2009). *Jaarverslag 2009. Werelderfgoed in Nederland*. [online] [Accessed 30 July 2012] Available from: <http://www.cultureelerfgoed.nl/node/634/>
- The Economist*. (26 August 2010). *UNESCO's world heritage sites. A danger list in danger*. [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010] Available from: <http://www.economist.com/node/16891951/print>
- The World Bank. *Diversifying investments to stimulate economic growth: promoting cultural heritage and sustainable tourism*. [online] [Accessed 26 May 2011] Available from: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTCHD/Resources/430063-1250192845352/MultidonorTF-portfolioireview7-9-09.pdf>
- Sustainable Business.com. (8 February 2010). *Everglades returned to World Heritage in Danger List*. [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010]. Available from: <http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/index.cfm/go/news.display/id/20775>
- The Guardian*. (29 July 2010) [online] [Accessed 25 October 2010]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jul/29/galapagos-withdrawn-heritage-danger-list>
- United Kingdom National Commission for UNESCO (10 November 2010). 'Wider Value of UNESCO to the UK'. [online] [Accessed 26 March 2012] Available from: <http://www.unesco.org.uk/uploads/Wider%20value%20of%20UNESCO%20to%20the%20UK.pdf>

Webpages UNESCO

- UNESCO, <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/movable-heritage-and-museums/armed-conflict-and-heritage/enhanced-protection/> [Accessed 12 March 2012]
- UNESCO, <http://www.unesco.org/news/en/unesco/about-us/who-are-we/history> [Accessed 16 June 2011]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=14175&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html [Accessed 29 April 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, http://whc.unesco.org/documents/publi_wh_papers_13_en.pdf [Accessed 25 August 2011]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/awhf> [Accessed 31 August 2011]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, whc.unesco.org [Accessed 22 February 2008]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/063.pdf [Accessed 28 September 2010]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/654.pdf [Accessed 3 April 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/periodicreporting/APA/cycle01/section2/668-summary.pdf> [Accessed 3 January 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/134> [Accessed 3 February 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/awhf> [Accessed 31 August 2011]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/cfu> [Accessed 28 April 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/globalstrategy/> [Accessed 16 June 2011]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list> [Accessed 24 July 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/stat#d1> [Accessed 24 July 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/463> [Accessed 28 February 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/nfit> [Accessed 9 April 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/partners/277/> [Accessed 28 April 2012]
- UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://www.unesco.org/en/statesparties> [Accessed 16 June 2011]

UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/statesparties/nl> [Accessed 30 May 2012]

UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/world-heritage-fund> [Accessed 3 April 2012]

UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/uploads/organizations/documents/organization-279-2.pdf> [Accessed 29 April 2012]

Other

Outcome during the expert meeting regarding this research at the *Vrije Universiteit*, Amsterdam, the Netherlands on 19 April 2012.

World Heritage Committee Documents

(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/sessions/>)

18 COM IX – SOC: Virunga National Park (DRC)

WHC-92/CONF.002/12

WHC-93/CONF.003/6

WHC-02/CONF.202/8

WHC-04/28.COM/INF.14A

WHC-06/30.COM/INF.12

WHC-06/30.COM/INF.19

WHC-07/31.COM/19A

WHC-09/33.COM/7.2

WHC-09/33.COM/7A

WHC-10/34.COM/7.2

WHC-10/34.COM/7B

WHC-10/34.COM/7B.Add

WHC-10/34.COM/INF.8B4

WHC-10/34.COM/14

WHC-11/35.COM/6

WHC-11/35.COM/7.2

WHC-11/35.COM/7A

WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add

WHC-11/35.COM/7B

WHC-11/35.COM/7C

WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C

WHC-11/35.COM/9A

WHC-11/35.COM/9B

WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A

WHC-11/35.COM/12A

WHC-11/35.COM/12B

WHC-11/35.COM/12C

WHC-12/36.COM/15.REV

World Heritage Committee Decisions

(<http://whc.unesco.org/en/decisions/>)

27 COM 7B

28 COM 15B

29 COM 7B

30 COM 7B

31 COM 5.2

31 COM 7B

31 COM 7.3

31 COM 18B

33 COM 7B

34 COM 5F2

34 COM 7.2

35 COM 8B

35 COM 12B

35 COM 12C

36 COM 19

36 COM 20

Annex I

Abbreviations

AB	Advisory Bodies
CCLG	Cultural Convention Liaison Group
CLUE	Research institute for the heritage and history of the cultural landscape and urban environment
DSOCR	Desired state of conservation for the removal
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EU	European Union
GA	General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
ICOMOS	International Council on Monuments and Sites
ICCROM	International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property
IGO	Intergovernmental Organization
MoU	Memory of Understanding
NFiT	Netherlands Funds-in-Trust
NGO	Non-governmental organization
OUV	Outstanding Universal Value
RBM	Result Based Management
RMM	Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism
SoOUV	Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
VU	<i>Vrije Universiteit</i> , Amsterdam

Annex II

List of World Heritage in Danger (2012)

State Party	Name Property	Inscription WHL	Inscription DL	N / C	Region	Reason inscription DL ³
Afghanistan	Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley	2003	2003	C	APA	Risk of collapse of Giant Buddha niches, irreversible deteriorations of mural paintings, looting and illicit excavations, use heritage as military posts and anti-personnel mines Political instability, inclination of the Minaret, lack of management plan, and illicit excavations and looting
	Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam	2002	2002	C	APA	
Belize	Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System	1996	2009	N	LAC	Potential destruction of mangrove and marine ecosystems
Central African Republic	Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park	1988	1997	N	AFR	Illegal grazing, uncontrolled poaching by armed groups and a deteriorating security situation
Chile	Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works	2005	2005	C	LAC	Fragile nature of structures due to lack of maintenance, looting materials and damage caused by wind
Colombia	Los Katíos National Park	1994	2009	N	LAC	Illegal logging, unauthorized settlements, fishing and hunting and threats infrastructure
Côte d'Ivoire	Comoé National Park	1983	2003	N	AFR	Potential impact of civil unrest, uncontrolled poaching and lack of effective management mechanisms Iron-ore mining concession inside Guinea, influx of refugees from Liberia and insufficient institutional structure
	Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve ¹	1981	1992	N	AFR	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Garamba National Park	1980	1996 (1984-1992)	N	AFR	Armed conflict and political instability, poaching and ill-adapted management capabilities Adverse refugee impact, increased poaching, irregular presence militia and settlers, and deforestation Looting of infrastructure and poaching of elephants and presence of mining sites Adverse impact due to conflict and increased poaching and illegal encroachment Adverse impact refugees, unauthorised presence militia and settlers and increased poaching, deforestation and pressure of fishing
	Kahuzi-Biega National Park	1980	1997	N	AFR	
	Okapi Wildlife Reserve	1996	1997	N	AFR	
	Salonga National Park	1984	1999	N	AFR	
	Virunga National Park	1979	1994	N	AFR	
Egypt	Abu Mena	1979	2001	C	ARB	Dramatic rise in water table, collapse structures and construction road
Ethiopia	Simien National Park	1978	1996	N	AFR	Depletion of Walia ibex population and other large mammals, increasing population, agricultural encroachment, and road construction
Georgia	Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery Historical Monuments of Mtskheta	1994	2010	C	EUR	Irreversible interventions as part a major reconstruction Lack management system, privatisation surrounding land and loss authenticity
		1994	2009	C	EUR	

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Name Property</i>	<i>Inscription WHL</i>	<i>Inscription DL</i>	<i>N / C</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Reason inscription DL³</i>
Guinea	Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve ¹	1981	1992	N	AFR	Iron-ore mining concession inside Guinea, influx of refugees from Liberia and insufficient institutional structure
Honduras	Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve	1982	2011 (1997-2007)	N	LAC	Illegal settlements, livestock grazing, logging, commercial fishing, and poaching, alien invasive species, management deficiencies, lack of law enforcement and potential impact hydroelectric development.
Indonesia	Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra	2004	2011	N	APA	Road construction, agricultural encroachment, illegal logging and poaching
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Bam and its Cultural Landscape	2004	2004	C	ARB	Damage following 2003 earthquake and development pressure
Iraq	Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat)	2003	2003	C	ARB	Nearby construction of a dam and armed conflict
	Samarra Archaeological City	2007	2007	C	ARB	Conflict prevents protection and management of the property
Jerusalem (Site proposed by Jordan) ²	Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls	1981	1982	C	ARB	Loss of authenticity and cultural significance, modification juridical status, lack of conservation policy and threatening effects of town planning
Madagascar	Rainforests of the Atsinanana	2007	2010	N	AFR	Illegal logging and poaching endangered lemurs
Mali	Timbuktu	1988	2012 (1990-2004)	C	AFR	Armed conflict
	Tomb of Askia	2004	2012	C	AFR	
Niger	Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves	1991	1992	N	AFR	Political instability and civil strife
Palestine	Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem	2012	2012	C	ARB	Vulnerability of the property, support the urgent and necessary consolidation works, as well as to safeguard the authenticity and integrity of the property
Panama	Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo – San Lorenzo	1980	2012	C	LAC	Deterioration and destruction of the fabric of the property by environmental factors, lack of a maintenance programme, polluted water; Erosion; Absence of management policies included in Management Plans; Uncontrolled urban development; Tourism pressures (in particular at Portobelo); Torrential rains
Peru	Chan Chan Archaeological Zone	1986	1986	C	LAC	Inadequate management, incapability to implement corrective measures, fragile state of conservation and increase level phreatic water table
Senegal	Niokolo-Koba National Park	1981	2007	N	AFR	Poaching and livestock grazing

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Name Property</i>	<i>Inscription WHL</i>	<i>Inscription DL</i>	<i>N / C</i>	<i>Region</i>	<i>Reason inscription DL³</i>
Serbia	Medieval Monuments in Kosovo	2004	2006	C	EUR	Lack of legal status, legislative protection buffer zones, implementation management plan and monitoring difficulties
Tanzania, United Republic of	Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara	1981	2004	C	AFR	Potential collapse of the historical and archaeological structures
Uganda	Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi	2001	2010	C	AFR	Destruction of the property by fire
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City	2004	2012	C	EUR	Proposed development of Liverpool Waters
United States of America	Everglades National Park	1979	2010 (1993- 2007)	N	EUR	Alterations hydrological regime, adjacent urban and agricultural growth, increased nutrient pollution, and reduction marine and estuarine biodiversity
Venezuela (Bolivarian	Coro and its Port	1993	2005	C	LAC	Decay of materials and structures, deterioration of architectural and urban coherence and lack of efficient management
Yemen	Historic Town of Zabid	1993	2000	C	ARB	Serious deterioration of built heritage

1 transboundary

2 No State Party mentioned by UNESCO, but as the contact person for this site is in the Arab States Unit, it is for this research counted within this region.

3 WHC-11/35.COM/7A, 7A.Add en 7B.Add + WHC-12/36.COM/7B and 19

ARB Arab States

AFR Africa

APA Asia and Pacific

EUR Europe and North America

LAC Latin American and the Caribbean

Annex IIa
Regional overview

Africa		Arab States		Asia and Pacific		Europe and North America		Latin America and the Caribbean	
N 12	C 4	N 0	C 7	N 1	C 2	N 1	C 4	N 3	C 4
Total: 16		Total: 7		Total: 3		Total: 5		Total: 7	
Total Nature: 17									
Total Culture: 21									

Annex IIb

Previously placed on List of World Heritage in Danger

<i>State Party</i>	<i>Name Property</i>	<i>Inscription WHL</i>	<i>Inscription DL</i>	<i>N / C</i>	<i>Region</i>
Albania	Butrint	1992	1997-2005	C	EUR
Algeria	Tipasa	1982	2002-2006	C	ARB
Benin	Royal Palaces of Abomey	1985	1985-2007	C	AFR
Brazil	Iguaçu National Park	1986	1999-2001	N	LAC
Bulgaria	Srebarna Nature Reserve	1983	1992-2003	N	EUR
Cambodia	Angkor	1992	1992-2004	C	LAC
Croatia	Old City of Dubrovnik	1979	1991-1998	C	EUR
Croatia	Plitvice Lakes National Park	1979	1992-1997	N	EUR
Ecuador	Galápagos Islands	1978	2007-2010	N	LAC
Ecuador	Sangay National Park	1983	1992-2005	N	LAC
Germany	Cologne Cathedral	1996	2004-2006	C	EUR
Germany	Dresden-Elbe Valley (Delisted in 2009)	2004	2006-2009	C	EUR
India	Group of monuments at Hampi	1986	1999-2006	C	APA
India	Manas Wildlife Sanctuary	1985	1992-2011	N	APA
Montenegro	Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	1979	1979-2003	C	EUR
Nepal	Kathmandu Valley	1979	2003-2007	C	APA
Oman	Bahla Fort	1987	1988-2004	C	ARB
Pakistan	Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore	1981	2000-2012	C	APA
Philippines	Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras	1995	2001-2012	C	APA
Poland	Wieliczka Salt Mine	1978	1989-1998	C	EUR
Senegal	Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary	1981	1984-1988 /2000-2006	N/C	AFR
Tanzania	Ngorongoro Conservation Area	1979	1984-1989	N	AFR
Tunisia	Ichkeul National Park	1980	1996-2006	N	ARB
Uganda	Rwenzori Mountains National Park	1994	1999-2004	N	AFR
United States of America	Yellowstone National Park	1978	1995-2003	N	EUR

Annex IIc

Overview all sites ever inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger

Property	Year	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Abu Mena															
Air and Ténéré Natural Reserves															
Angkor															
Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat)															
Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery															
Bahla Fort												■	■	■	■
Bam and its Cultural Landscape															
Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System															
Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem															
Butrint															
Chan Chan Archaeological Zone										■	■	■	■	■	■
Cologne Cathedral															
Comoé National Park															
Coro and its Port															
Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley															
Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary								■	■	■	■				
Dresden-Elbe Valley															
Dubrovnik, Old City of															■
Everglades National Park															
Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore															
Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello – San Lorenzo															
Galápagos Islands															
Garamba National Park								■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Group of monuments at Hampi															
Historic Town of Zabid															
Historical Monuments of Mtskheta															
Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works															
Ichkeul National Park															
Iguaçu National Park															
Kahuzi-Biega National Park															

[illegible]

Annex IIc

Overview all sites ever inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger

Property	Year	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991
Kathmandu Valley															
Los Katíos National Park															
Manas Wildlife Sanctuary															
Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park															
Medieval Monuments in Kosovo															
Minaret + Archaeological Remains of Jam															
Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve*															
Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ngorongoro Conservation Area								■	■	■	■	■			
Okapi Wildlife Reserve															
Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls					■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Plitvice Lakes National Park															
Rainforests of the Atsinanana															
Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras															
Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve															
Royal Palaces of Abomey									■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara															
Rwenzori Mountains National Park															
Salonga National Park															
Samarra Archaeological City															
Sangay National Park															
Simien National Park															
Srebarna Nature Reserve															
Timbuktu														■	■
Tipasa															
Tomb of Askia															
Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi															
Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra															
Virunga National Park															
Wieliczka Salt Mine													■	■	■
Yellowstone National Park															

[illegible]

While every effort has been made to trace and acknowledge copyright holders regarding the illustrations, we would like to apologize should there have been any errors or omissions.

Cover photo: D.F. Wouda Steam Pumping Station, Lemmer, the Netherlands. © H.C. Westrik

Copyright: H.C. Westrik, Den Haag
Proofread: Andrew Manning
Graphic design: Nel Punt, Weesp

Den Haag, 31 July 2012

CLUE
VU University Amsterdam
Faculty of Arts
De Boelelaan 1105

T +31 (0) 20 59 82 876

clue.let@vu.nl
www.clue.nu

Angkor (Cambodia).
© UNESCO / F. Bandarin





Walled City of Baku with
the Shirvanshah's Palace and
Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan).
© UNESCO / G. Gonzalez-
Brigas

Borobudur Temple
Compounds (Indonesia).
© UNESCO / G. Boccardi



Virunga National Park
(Democratic Republic
of the Congo).
© UNESCO / Yvette Kaboza



Humberstone and Santa
Laura Saltpeter Works,
Canal de las montañas
salitras (Chile).
© UNESCO / Nuria Sanz



CLUE
VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM
FACULTY OF ARTS
DE BOELELAAN 1105
1081 HV AMSTERDAM

T +31(0)20 59 82 876

CLUE.LET@VU.NL
WWW.CLUE.NU